

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



Gregory of cyprus: A study of church and culture in late thirteenth century byzantium.

Sopko, A. J

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to:

- Share: to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Gregory of Cyprus:
A Study of Church and Culture
in Late Thirteenth Century Byzantium

Andrew J. Sopko

Submitted for the PhD Degree

King's College, London



BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Variable print quality

Andrew J. Sopko

'Gregory of Cyprus: A Study of
Church and Culture in Late
Thirteenth Century Byzantium'

Gregory II of Cyprus (1241-1290), a late thirteenth century Patriarch of Constantinople, was a leading figure in the cultural revival which occurred at Byzantium following its recapture from the Latins in 1261. Although born on Cyprus, he later became closely involved with the re-establishment of education, classical studies and theological thought under the early Palaiologoi. While a lay teacher of rhetoric in the imperial capital, he became a unionist and supported Michael VIII's Union of Lyons. Later, after a renunciation of his unionist activities, he was made Patriarch of Constantinople. During his Patriarchate, the ecclesiastical difficulties which resulted from the Union of Lyons disrupted his reign. Foremost of these difficulties was the problem of the Procession of the Holy Spirit which he attempted to settle with a compromise solution. His viewpoint, although Orthodox, was largely misunderstood by his contemporaries and resulted in his abdication.

In tracing the career of Gregory of Cyprus, biographical details illuminate his primary role in the early Palaiologan revival. As classicist and ecclesiastic, he provided the impetus for cultural revival and advancement in both the Hellenic and Christian spheres of Byzantine civilisation. As educator, literateur, and theologian, he helped rejuvenate the long Constantinopolitan cultural tradition which had been broken by the Latin occupation. Above all, his career demonstrates that the Church played an active role in the revival of this tradition, not only in theological thought but also in the continuation of classical literary studies.

Table of Contents.

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Abstract | 1 |
| List of Abbreviations..... | 3 |
| Short Titles | 4-6 |
| Introduction | 7-19 |
| I. The Setting : Byzantium from the Recapture of Constantinople to the End of the Arsenite Schism ... | 20-43 |
| II. Gregory's Early Life (1241-1273) | 44-61 |
| III. Unionist and Anti-Unionist (1273-1282) | 62-88 |
| IV. Patriarch of Constantinople (1283-1290) | 89-128 |
| V. The Pneumatological Problem | 129-156 |
| VI. Gregory's Letters: A Reflection of His Intellectual Milieu | 157-171 |
| VII. The Legacy of Gregory of Cyprus | 172-215 |
| Conclusion : Gregory's Theology : Its Method and Place in Byzantine Thought | 216-232 |
| Appendices : The Works of Gregory of Cyprus | 234-235 |
| Works Attributed to Gregory of Cyprus | 236 |
| Works Erroneously Attributed to Gregory of Cyprus | 236 |
| The Letters of Gregory of Cyprus | 237-245 |
| Abdication Documents | 246 |
| A Letter of John Cheilas to the Emperor ... | 247-248 |
| Bibliography | 249-270 |

Note: Certain changes have been introduced into the text after the binding. Although the pagination is sometimes not consecutive, the text is continuous.

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|-------------|--|
| <u>AASS</u> | <u>Acta Sanctorum</u> |
| <u>AB</u> | <u>Analecta Bollandiana</u> |
| <u>B</u> | <u>Byzantion</u> |
| <u>BNJ</u> | <u>Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher</u> |
| <u>BS</u> | <u>Byzantinoslavica</u> |
| <u>BZ</u> | <u>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</u> |
| <u>CC</u> | <u>Christianskoe Čtenie</u> |
| <u>CMH</u> | <u>Cambridge Medieval History</u> |
| <u>CSHB</u> | <u>Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae</u> |
| <u>DOP</u> | <u>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</u> |
| <u>DTC</u> | <u>Dictionnaire de theologie catholique</u> |
| <u>EEBS</u> | <u>Ἑλληνικαὶ Ἑταιρικοὶ Εὐχολογικοὶ Οἰκουμενικοὶ</u> |
| <u>EF</u> | <u>Ἑλληνολατινικὸς Φάρος</u> |
| <u>EO</u> | <u>Echos d'Orient</u> |
| <u>GRBS</u> | <u>Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies</u> |
| <u>JÖRB</u> | <u>Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft</u> |
| <u>MPG</u> | <u>J.P. Migne, Patrologia series Graeco-Latina</u> |
| <u>OCP</u> | <u>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</u> |
| <u>REB</u> | <u>Revue des Etudes Byzantines</u> |
| <u>VV</u> | <u>Vizantijskij Vremennik</u> |
| <u>OHE</u> | <u>Ομηροκεντρικὴ καὶ Ἡοικὴ Ἑκφυλοποιεῖα</u> |

Short Titles

- Akropolites G. Akropolites, Opera, ed. A. Heisenberg
(Leipzig, 1903) Volume I, Historia, Breviarium
Historiae, Theodori Scutariotae additamenta.
- Angold M. Angold, A Byzantine Government in Exile:
Government and Society Under the Laskarids of
Nicaea (London, 1975).
- Art et Société Art et Société à Byzance sous les Palaeologues
(Venice, 1971).
- Autobiography Gregory of Cyprus, Διηγήσεως μετ' ἑξῆς λόγος τὰ
κατ' ἐαυτὸν περιέχων - cc. 19-30.
- Barker E. Barker, Social and Political Thought in
Byzantium (Oxford, 1957, 1961).
- Beck H. Beck, Kirche und theologische Literatur im
byzantinischen Reich (Munich, 1959).
- Blemmydes N. Blemmydes, Curriculum Vitae et Carmina,
ed. A. Heisenberg (Leipzig, 1896).
- Bréhier L. Bréhier, Le monde byzantin III, La
civilisation byzantine (Paris, 1970).
- Eustratiades Ἐπιστολαὶ Γρηγορίου τοῦ Κυπρίου,
ed. S. Eustratiades, EF 1-5 (Alexandria, 1908-
1910).
- 1 (1908) pp. 76-106 Introduction
107-108 Letter 1
409-439 Letters 2-45
- 2 (1908) 195-211 Letters 46-65
../..

- Eustratiades (cont.) 3 (1909) pp. 5-48 Letters 66-115
 281-296 Letters 116-130
 4 (1909) 5-29 Letters 131-141
 97-128 Letters 142-166
 5 (1910) 213-226 Letters 167-173
 339-352 Letters 174-184
 445-451 Letters 185-187
 489-500 Letters 188-197
- Fuchs F. Fuchs, Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter (Leipzig, 1926, reprinted Amsterdam, 1964).
- Geanakoplos D.J. Geanakoplos, Emperor Michael Palaeologos and the West (Hamden, Conn., 1973).
- Gregoras N. Gregoras, Byzantina Historia, CSHB, ed. L. Schopen, 3 volumes (Bonn, 1829-55).
- Hill Sir G.F. Hill, A History of Cyprus, volumes 2 and 3 (Cambridge, 1948).
- Janin R. Janin, Les eglises et les monastères de Constantinople (second edition, Paris, 1969).
- Kariye Djami P. Underwood, ed., The Kariye Djami, 4 volumes (New York, Princeton 1966-75). Volume 4: Studies in the Art of the Kariye Djami (Princeton, 1975).
- Krumbacher K. Krumbacher, Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des östro-mischen Reiches (Munich, 1897).
- Metochites G. Metochites, Historia dogmatica, ed. A. Mai and G. Cozza-Luzi, Parts I, II Nova Patrum bibliotheca 8 (1871) and III, 10 (1905).
- Nicol D.M. Nicol, The Last Centuries of Byzantium (London, 1972).

- Ostrogorsky G. Ostrogorsky, History of the Byzantine State (Oxford 1968).
- Pachymeres G. Pachymeres, De Michaelle et Andronico Palaeologis, CSHB, ed. I. Bekker, 2 volumes (Bonn, 1835).
- Régestes V. Laurent, Les Régestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople, 1, part 4, Les Régestes de 1208 à 1309 (Paris, 1971).
- Sykoutres I. Sykoutres, Περὶ τὸ ἐχέμα τῶν Ἀρσενιατῶν, Ἑλληνικά, 2 (1929) pp. 267-332, 3 (1930) pp. 15-44, 5 (1932) pp. 107-126.
- Troitskij I.E. Troitskij, Arsenij i Arsenity (reprint, London, 1973).
- Vasiliev A.A. Vasiliev, History of the Byzantine Empire (Madison and Milwaukee, 1964).

Introduction

In choosing the title 'Gregory of Cyprus: A Study of Church and Culture in Late Thirteenth Century Byzantium', my aim was to demonstrate the two concurrent intentions of my thesis. First, it is a biography of the thirteenth century Patriarch of Constantinople, Gregory II. A study of his life and work leads directly to the second emphasis of my work, Constantinopolitan culture in the late thirteenth century with particular attention given to the role of the Byzantine Church as a cultural force. Gregory of Cyprus serves as an ideal focal point for this type of study. As both scholar and churchman, he was not only in contact with the cultural developments of his time, but actually responsible for many of them. Because his greatest contributions were theological and rhetorical, these will receive special attention, but he was also involved in other aspects of Palaiologan culture, especially the revival of education.

The phenomenon of the cultural revival in which Gregory participated at Constantinople under the early Palaiologoi had a dual nature. Despite the difficult social and political conditions of the period, retrospection upon the past brought a renewed awareness of the roots of Byzantine civilisation in ancient Greece and in the Patristic heritage of early Christianity. Both elements are present in the work of Gregory of Cyprus but it should not be thought that this renewed awareness demonstrated a complete rediscovery of something long forgotten by the Byzantines. This renewed cultural activity of the late thirteenth century was not a renaissance but an intensification of contact with the past on the part of the Byzantines. (1) Use of the term 'renaissance', which has caused some confusion in assessing the true significance of the cultural revival of the late thirteenth century and its continuation in the fourteenth, has been scrupulously avoided in what follows here. (2)

Whatever the reason for this intensification of interest in their past, whether partially the result of an identity crisis in the face of the threat of the West or just the consequence of scholarly curiosity, it completely permeated every aspect of Byzantine culture (3). In addition to the biographical nature of this thesis, its other primary aim will be to demonstrate how this cultural intensification manifested itself and how the Byzantine Church helped nurture it. Naturally, this will be most obvious in the theological realm but the Church's influence was not confined to this discipline only. The dual nature of the Palaiologan revival, both religious and 'secular' (i.e. classical), bore a direct relationship to the Church. Revival of Hellenic studies and classical scholarship often occurred under the auspices of the Church or through the efforts of churchmen. Even when uninvolved, a tolerant attitude on the part of the official Church allowed classical learning to flourish.

Gregory of Cyprus' own devotion to both theology and classical studies (particularly rhetoric) provides a prime example of ecclesiastical participation in the cultural revival. Because he showed his greatest originality as a theologian, his theology holds pride of place in this work. Although much of his output as a rhetorician and classical scholar predates his Patriarchate, his interest continued while Patriarch, albeit on a reduced scale. Thus, his classical interests, although of secondary importance when compared with the originality of his theological thought, have a place in this thesis. Finally, his role in the revival of education, which also predated his Patriarchate but which probably occurred in connection with a Constantinopolitan monastery, will also be explored.

Although my title might imply an overall study of late thirteenth century Byzantine culture, I thought it more advantageous to devote

the bulk of my study to those aspects which concerned Gregory directly. These aspects were really the most prominent at late thirteenth century Constantinople and the actual first fruits of the Palaiologan revival. New currents in philosophy, scientific thought, and art had their roots in this period, but these did not come to fruition at Constantinople until the following century. In order to present as complete a view as possible of early Palaiologan culture at Constantinople, I have devoted a small amount of space to philosophic, scientific, and artistic matters in chapter seven. By relating these to the other material found in this thesis, I hope to have provided at least a precursory view of early Palaiologan culture. A survey of unrelated (and therefore unmentioned) cultural figures and trends of the time would have further obscured Gregory's significance, a significance still unappreciated because of the confused events of the period. In the case of John Bekkos, certainly a major figure in the ecclesiastical events of the period, it was necessary here to give him less attention than he has normally received. A number of studies have been done on Bekkos; none has been done on Gregory of Cyprus.

The events of the late thirteenth century added another difficulty to the format of my presentation. Having stressed the dual nature of the Palaiologan revival in this introduction, evidence of this classical-ecclesiastical duality will first be found in chapters two and three. In these chapters, this duality will best be seen in the re-establishment of both secular and religious higher education and also in the Church's allowance for the teaching of classical subjects in schools attached to monasteries. Chapters four and five, by necessity are completely ecclesiastical and theological in content. Only in chapter six would circumstances allow to return to the classical revival of the early Palaiologan period. Here, the letters written by the Patriarch

Gregory to his friend Raoulaina during the latter part of his reign are used as proof of the continuation of that revival. This enabled me to finally make a comparison of the classical/ecclesiastical aspects of the Palaiologan revival in chapter seven and to arrive at some conclusions. This was the only practicable solution since a preoccupation with theological matters marks almost the entire period.

While this thesis intends to provide a survey of the intellectual and cultural life of the late thirteenth century, it can only do this by reference to both the life of Gregory of Cyprus and the principal political/ecclesiastical events of the period. Often, these are one and the same - the events of Gregory's life are interwoven with those episodes which would determine the course of late Byzantine civilisation. Just as often, whether these events should be considered political and/or ecclesiastical is difficult to decide. The Arsenite schism and the Union of Lyons with its consequences provide the scenario for one of the most troubled periods in the internal history of the Empire. It has not been my intention to provide a complete description and analysis of the Arsenite movement and the events associated with Lyons but to incorporate those particular aspects which warrant inclusion in the text through association with Gregory of Cyprus.

Because of the very often complicated nature of the events of the late thirteenth century, the need for a chapter which provided a general introduction to the period was evident to me from the inception of my work. Chapter one serves this purpose, briefly presenting the principal events from the recapture of Constantinople in 1261 to the end of the Arsenite schism in 1310. It is hoped that the ensuing chapters will relate Gregory's life to these principal events. It is also hoped that the relationship between Gregory's life, these

principal events, and the cultural and intellectual developments under the first two Palaiologoi will then become clearer. Because of the more general nature of the first chapter, I designed its apparatus to serve as a guide to the basic literature concerning the principal personalities and events of the period. I was then able to provide the more detailed footnotes necessary for the later chapters without the encumbrance of references to these more basic works.

I now give a brief résumé of the chapters individually, the particular problems posed in them, and the chief research tools used in the attempt to provide solutions to these problems. Having already devoted some space to chapter one, it remains only to mention those works which were most helpful to an understanding of the events which it describes. The monumental Arsenij i Arsenity of I.E. Troitskij, originally published in numbers of Christianskoe Čtenie between 1867 and 1872 and reprinted in 1973, has yet to be superseded as a detailed history of late thirteenth-century Byzantium. Containing a wealth of information, it proved useful not only for the more general nature of chapter one, but also for its illuminating analyses of many passages from the Byzantine historians, important to later chapters. Less detailed but still useful, I. Sykoutres' 'Περὶ τὸ ἐχῆμα τῶν Ἀρσενιατῶν', which appeared in volumes two, three, and five of 'Ἑλληνικά', scrutinizes some of the documents important to an understanding of the Arsenite schism but lacks the cohesion of Troitskij's study. Also important because of its inclusion of the documents which reconciled the Arsenites to the Church is V. Laurent's 'Les grandes crises religieuses à Byzance - La fin du schisme Arsénite', which appeared in Académie Roumaine-Bulletin de la section historique in 1945.

In addition to surveying the early life of Gregory of Cyprus, chapter two is concerned with the legacy of Nicaean culture and its

role as a progenitor of the Palaiologan revival. There can be no more authoritative a source for Gregory's early years than his own autobiography in volume 142 of Migne's Patrologia Graeca, where many of his other rhetorical and theological works will be found. As the only source which describes Gregory's early years, its value is immeasurable. The principal concern of the future Patriarch's youth, the acquisition of a decent education, lends itself well to the other aspect of the chapter, the re-establishment of Constantinopolitan educational institutions which marked the beginning of the Palaiologan cultural revival. Despite the amount of secondary source speculation on the problem, evident from the footnotes, the proof for the existence of two distinct institutions of secular and religious higher education at Constantinople in the late 1260's remains ambiguous. Gregory's own autobiography offers some illumination on the secular course of Akropolites while Pachymeres, the primary source for so much of the material in this thesis, offers a few lines on the re-establishment of religious education by Holobolos. (5) Because of the paucity of information, some speculation was necessary concerning the relationship between these institutions.

An examination of educational institutions also marks the beginning of chapter three. The decade of Gregory's life examined in this chapter saw a continuation in the revival of education at Constantinople in which he himself participated. A growing interest in Hellenic studies was the principal result of the re-established educational tradition with Gregory taking the lead as the chief teacher and belletrist of the period. Both his letters and his rhetorical works serve as prime examples of the period's intensification of classical studies. The letters of Gregory of Cyprus, although heavy with rhetoric, help construct a more complete picture of this period of his life. Their existence in European libraries was noted

only as recently as the late nineteenth century. (6) Early in this century, S. Eustratiades edited many of them (197 of the over 240 extant) for volumes one through five of the journal of the Patriarchate of Alexandria, Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φόρος. These were also published in a single volume entitled Γρηγορίου τοῦ Κυπρίου ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ μῦθοι, but the book is now virtually unobtainable except for a copy I found in the Vatican Library.

While the merit and usefulness of Eustratiades' edition of the letters cannot be denied, he unfortunately ignored the manuscript tradition and misplaced some of the letters in his chronology. This situation was rectified by W. Lameere in his La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre, which examines all the manuscripts of the letters and thus provides a vital research tool for the student of Gregory of Cyprus. To avoid confusion in the apparatus, I have adhered to the numbers given to the letters by Eustratiades. Those letters which he did not edit are identified in the apparatus by Lameere's chronological notation followed by their actual manuscript location. According to Lameere, Vaticanus graecus 1085 provides the oldest and most reliable manuscript of the letters and I have depended on this codex for those letters not found in Eustratiades' group. Vaticanus graecus 1085 also contains some gaps, however, and letters not found in it were in Vaticanus graecus 1696 and Mutinensis graecus 82. Although the letters shed particular light upon the academic career of Gregory, they do not illuminate the other aspect of the third chapter, the Union of Lyons and Gregory's role in it. Pachymeres and Gregoras give accounts of his participation but there is never a clue as to when his unionist sentiments gave way to the anti-unionist feelings of his later life.

Gregory's stormy Patriarchate serves as the dominant theme

for chapter four. Pachymeres has left a detailed account of the circumstances, especially the Council of 1285 and the events leading to Gregory's resignation. As an eyewitness to these events, his account was especially important to the reconstruction of them. Gregoras' account, more abbreviated and also less useful since he wrote it many years afterwards, still contains passages of interest. The third narrative of the period, the Historia dogmatica of George Metochites can hardly be considered an unbiased observation since its author was one of the chief supporters of John Bekkos, the theological opponent of the Patriarch. According to Metochites, Gregory acted throughout his Patriarchate 'like a fox.... to conceal the real wolf that he was'. (8) Nonetheless, this work offers information not found in the description of Pachymeres. An excellent supplement to all these accounts is V. Laurent's Les Régestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople. In it, all of the patriarchal decrees, letters, and other documents of Gregory's reign are described.

Chapter five can actually be considered an extension of the preceding chapter. The theological debates of the 1280's very often depended on the turn of a word and it is hoped that the fifth chapter will help clarify the reasons for the events described in the fourth. These debates, however, were more than a matter of semantics. Being a work devoted to cultural and intellectual history, it seems proper that this thesis should closely examine the pneumatological problem which disrupted Gregory's Patriarchate. More than a semantic problem and not merely a theological puzzle, the filioque together with its implications was the intellectual and cultural problem 'par excellence' of the late thirteenth century. Gregory's solution demonstrated a new awareness of the Patristic tradition at Byzantium and provided another dimension to the Palaiologan revival, although his approach

confounded his opponents. If the general opposition of the Church appears to negate my concept of the Byzantine Church as a creative cultural force in the late thirteenth century, it should be stressed that Gregory, as its chief spokesman, demonstrated its vitality even if his contemporaries did not. Surely the fact that his theology was eventually proclaimed Orthodox should also count for something. In presenting Gregory's solution, many passages from his theological writings were quoted at length to stress the Patristic foundations of his 'approach'. To date, very little has appeared concerning his theology, but mention should be made of Olivier Clement's 'Grégoire de Chypre, de l'ekporèse de Saint Esprit', an article which appeared in Istina in 1972 that aids greatly in appreciating the Patriarch's thought. Although of a more general nature, the 'background' section included at the beginning of the chapter seemed a necessity in order to place the pneumatology of Gregory in its proper perspective. This section underlines the divergence in the approach of East and West to the problem, an important consideration due to the fact that the Patriarch reached his solution after reflection upon the views of both traditions.

Chapter six focuses upon the letters of Gregory as a guide to the intellectual ideals of the classical revival under the early Palaiologoi and to those individuals who participated in it. A primary intention of the chapter is to show that, despite his ecclesiastical involvement, Gregory managed to continue his classical studies while Patriarch. This can be discerned from the many letters which he wrote to his friend Theodora Raoulaina. In order to consider all the Raoulaina letters, it was necessary to use Vaticanus graecus 1085 for the research. Because past commentators and editors have ignored the manuscript tradition, a list of

these letters has never appeared nor have the documents been studied in their historical context.

The seventh chapter surveys the legacy of Gregory of Cyprus and his historical significance for not only the thirteenth century but for the ensuing centuries as well. Here, Gregory's historical importance as a forerunner of Palamas, receives attention. The first chapter of John Meyendorff's book, A Study of Gregory Palamas was especially helpful in understanding the link between the two theologians. As for the influence of the Patriarch's non-theological concerns, this is best seen in the references made to him in the writings of his pupil Nikephoros Choumnos. Having examined the ecclesiastical/classical duality of the Patriarch's legacy, the chapter then returns to the narrower perspective of the late thirteenth century, assessing Gregory's place in that cultural milieu while at the same time offering some conclusions concerning the nature of early Palaiologan culture and the Church's role in it. Finally, because of the reaction to the West which Gregory's theology represents, there is a brief cultural comparison between the two spheres of Christendom as they existed in the last decades of the thirteenth century.

The growth of Palaiologan culture that accompanies Gregory's own progress as a thinker is no mere coincidence. He contributed much to the Palaiologan revival and many of its early cultural achievements coincide with his own efforts. First, there is the rather underdeveloped nature of Nicaean culture which can be compared with Gregory's own frustrating search for a decent education. Then, with the re-establishment of higher education at Constantinople and the participation of the future Patriarch in it, the scene is set for future cultural development. Upon the foundation of new educational

institutions, the classical revival of the Palaiologan period begins, roughly contemporary with the professorship and classical scholarship of Gregory at Constantinople. Next, the problems created by the Union of Lyons provide the impetus for the second aspect of the Palaiologan revival, the reappearance of creative theological speculation at Byzantium. Once again, the work of Gregory of Cyprus is so inseparable from this development that he must be considered its initiator. Finally, all of these late thirteenth century cultural developments, not the least among them being the contributions of Gregory, establish the impetus for the full flowering of the revival in the fourteenth century.

Despite the difficult religious, political, and economic circumstances which tormented the Byzantine Empire at the end of the thirteenth century, its cultural life flourished. Because this study concerns primarily the Empire's internal life, a mention of its equally problematic external situation should not be neglected. The recurrent threat of the West will not be ignored in what follows but the Turkish threat, which was just as great, receives only a brief reference since it stands on the periphery of my primary concern. Within and without, it was a time of crisis, yet Byzantine culture weathered the storm and produced personalities of great creativity. In the first rank of these was Gregory of Cyprus, whose own personal life was disrupted by many of these crises yet who still managed to make lasting contributions to the Palaiologan revival. An account of his life and times enables us to appreciate his own judgement on the merit of history. It 'permits the praise or blame of those recounted... and transmits to posterity subjects worthy of admiration'.(9) Late thirteenth century Byzantium bequeathed such a subject in the person of Gregory himself.

Note:- Although Gregory's actual name was George until the time of his election as Patriarch, Gregory has been used throughout the text for the sake of continuity.

Notes - Introduction

- (1) Cf. I. Ševčenko's remarks in 'Theodore Metochites, Chora, and the Intellectual Trends of His Time', Kariye Djami 4, p. 19.
- (2) Cf. the arguments of A. Heisenberg against the concept of a renaissance in his 'Das Problem der Renaissance in Byzance', Historische Zeitschrift 133(1926), pp. 393-412 and contrast them with the opposing views of R. Guiland, Essai sur Nicéphore Grégoras (Paris, 1926), pp. 294-95 and C. Newmann, 'Byzantinische Kultur und Renaissancekultur', Historische Zeitschrift 91(1903), pp. 215-32. Note also the more recent work by S. Runciman, The Last Byzantine Renaissance (Cambridge, 1970).
- (3) For an explanation of the thirteenth century revival in light of the recent studies of comparable social situations, see D.J. Geanakoplos, Interaction of the 'Sibling' Byzantine and Western Cultures (New Haven, 1976).
- (4) This does not mean I have eliminated merely for the sake of convenience. Constant references to a figure such as Maximos Planudes will be found since he was connected in a significant way with the cultural milieu of Gregory. Conversely, no references will be found to someone such as the poet Manuel Philes.. Although he lived in the late thirteenth century, his principal period of creativity belongs to the early fourteenth century and his output is completely unrelated to Gregory's.
- (5) Autobiography cc. 25C-28A, Pachymeres I p. 283.
- (6) P.K. Enepekides, The Letters of Maximos Margunios, Bishop of Kythera (Athens, 1970), pp. 17-18.
- (7) Cf. also the remarks of J. Darrouzès, Recherches sur les 'Oxéïxia de l'Eglise Byzantine (Paris, 1970), p. 455.
- (8) G. Metochites I p. 36.
- (9) Gregory of Cyprus, 'Laudatio Andronici', MPC 142, c. 388B.

I. The Setting:

Byzantium from the Recapture of Constantinople to the End of the Arsenite Schism

When the city of Constantinople was seized from the Latins in 1261 by the armies of the Byzantine government-in-exile at Nicaea, the Byzantine Empire was once again established in its age-old capital. A half century of humiliation at the hands of Western invaders had ended and an Orthodox Emperor ruled once again from the shores of the Bosphorus. The Latin Empire of Constantinople, founded as the result of the Fourth Crusade in 1204, had always been weak; it owed its prolonged existence chiefly to the general disunity of the Byzantines themselves. Besides Nicaea, there was at least one other serious contender for the prize of Empire - Epiros of northern Greece, the earliest centre of resistance against the Latins and a constant threat to the aspirations of Nicaea. But it was Nicaea which delivered the almost effortless 'coup de grace' to the Latins in 1261 and reaped the prize of Constantinople and legitimacy.

The Empire of Nicaea had been established shortly after the Latin occupation of Constantinople by Theodore Laskaris, a son-in-law of Alexios III, one of the last Emperors of Byzantium prior to the Fourth Crusade. Under the Laskarids, Nicaea and the adjacent region of western Asia Minor became a miniature version of the former Empire. Within the confines of the Nicaean state the imperial government continued to function and the ecclesiastical and cultural institutions to flourish, albeit on a reduced scale. It was not a member of the Laskaris family, however, who ruled at Nicaea when Constantinople was restored to Byzantine sovereignty, but a nobleman named Michael Palaiologos. And it was with Michael VIII Palaiologos that the last and longest reigning imperial dynasty of Byzantium began.

In 1258, Michael had been elected as new regent and guardian to the boy Emperor John IV Laskaris following the murder of the current guardian of the Emperor, George Mouzalon. That Michael Palaiologos had some part in the crime is not difficult to believe, for his rise to power was swift following it. (1) By year's end, Michael was well on his way to becoming sole sovereign. At his instigation, the coronation of the young Emperor was postponed 'until his maturity' and Michael and his wife were crowned instead. (2) When Michael took possession of Constantinople in 1261, it was he who led the triumphal procession into the city. If this in itself did not strike an ominous note for the future of the rightful Emperor, the announcement of Michael's son as heir-presumptive at the end of the festivities completely removed the possibility of John IV Laskaris ever regaining his throne. (3)

Equally conspicuous at the celebrations was the absence of the Patriarch of Constantinople himself. (4) Michael's usurpation of imperial power had not gone down well with the Patriarch Arsenios, who felt it his duty as the moral conscience of the Empire, to protest the Emperor's actions. Arsenios, a very simple and uneducated man, but a person of strong convictions, had been forced to perform the double coronation of Palaiologos and his wife at Nicaea. Consequently, he sent himself into a self-imposed exile, refusing to have any communication with the Emperor. At Michael's instigation, and not without some protest from the episcopacy, a new Patriarch was elected to take Arsenios' place. Within a year, however, the new Patriarch had died and the patriarchal throne was once again vacant. Byzantium had a new Emperor but was without a Patriarch. (5)

Michael desired a second coronation to mark the re-establishment of his Empire (and his authority) at Constantinople but this was not

possible without a Patriarch. Even as he instituted the search for candidates, many recalled the uncanonical dismissal of Arsenios, who remained in exile. Following negotiations and an imperial apology, the former Patriarch was reinstated, and the second coronation performed. (6)

The re-established Empire over which Michael presided was restricted in extent. It consisted of no more than a handful of islands in the Aegean, the western extremities of Asia Minor, Thrace, and Macedonia. There was always the threat of a renewed Latin attempt to recapture Constantinople in addition to the 'pretensions' of the Epirote state. Any hope for the Empire's continued survival depended upon a solution to these external threats. Internally, the reconstituted Empire's first months of existence reflected a general feeling of confidence which emanated from the possession of Constantinople itself. Arsenios once again presided over a Church possessed of renewed awareness of its Orthodoxy, especially after the experience of Latin Christianity. Intellectuals and artists returned to a capital whose reputation for learning and culture was about to be revitalised under the Emperor himself. But this period of internal tranquility proved ephemeral.

Michael VIII had every intention of making certain that the dynasty of Palaiologos would continue to occupy the throne. To his mind, John IV Laskaris' continued existence posed the primary threat to his plans. Secretly, he had the young Emperor blinded, an action which traditionally disqualified a person from holding the imperial office. When the Patriarch Arsenios learned of the crime, he immediately excommunicated the Emperor. (7) For the next two years, a state of polarity existed between the Patriarch and the Emperor. Arsenios refused to lift the excommunication despite Michael's many personal entreaties. Finally, in the spring of 1264, the Emperor convened a synod designed to remove the Patriarch on

trumped-up charges. Arsenios was invited to appear but refused. In effect, his refusal became one of the principal grounds for his deposition. At the end of May 1264, he was removed from office and sent into exile where he later died. (8)

The removal of Arsenios from the Patriarchate did not end Michael's excommunication. Another Patriarch, Germanos III, was appointed and likewise refused to remove it. Within a year, he was also forced to resign and yet another Patriarch was chosen. Joseph I, the third occupant of the patriarchal throne in as many years, finally conceded to the Emperor's wishes and in 1267, Michael was received into the Church once again. (9) Nonetheless, the lifting of the excommunication brought more pain than healing to Byzantium. Former supporters of the Patriarch Arsenios were especially enraged at this turn of events; the deposition of Arsenios had been bad enough, but the termination of the excommunication was absolutely intolerable to them. The centuries-old struggle between religious-political parties was about to be renewed at Constantinople. (10)

Conflict between religious-political parties within the Byzantine Church had its origins in the late eighth century at the Seventh Ecumenical Council when former iconoclasts were received into the Church again. Despite this, not everyone agreed with the decision, especially the representatives of monasticism. From this time there was a constant struggle for control of ecclesiastical administration between two parties, the conservative, monastic oriented zealots (ζηλωταί) and the more flexible moderates (πολιτικοί). (11) Fighters for the independence of the Church from state control, the zealots were stringent adherents to Orthodoxy and drew their support from the monks and the great mass of uneducated clergy and people. In contrast, the moderates, a group largely supported by the secular

clergy and the educated classes, permitted state influence upon the Church so long as its Orthodoxy remained intact. Following the re-establishment of the Empire at Constantinople, it was not until the deposition of the Patriarch Arsenios that a suitable circumstance had been created for the reassertion of the identities of both parties. With the pardon of the Emperor by the Patriarch Joseph, the followers of Arsenios became the chief representatives of the 'zealot' ideal in late thirteenth century Byzantium while those associated with Joseph had adopted the more 'moderate' position.

Eager that they should not pollute themselves by contact with others who did not hold their views, the 'Arsenites' broke off communion with the rest of the Church, creating a schism that would disrupt Byzantine society for almost half a century. As their motto, the Arsenites took words from St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians (2:21) 'Touch not, handle not'. By this, they meant that there were to be no dealings with those whom Arsenios had condemned; i.e. the Emperor and all who accepted the removal of his excommunication. (12)

In reality, the Arsenites considered themselves the representatives of the true Church, all others outside their group having betrayed the faith. Despite their high ideals of canon law and morals, there were political motivations inherent in their policies. Many of the bishops who led the party came from Asia Minor, a centre of loyalty to the Laskaris family. From its very inception, the Arsenite schism reflected anger not only with the ecclesiastical policies of Michael VIII, but with his usurpation of power as well. (13)

In spite of his difficulties with the Church, Michael continued to conduct a vigorous foreign policy in response to the external dangers which threatened his Empire. In 1264, after its defeat by Byzantine forces, Epiros sued for peace and recognised the sovereignty

of Michael. (14) But this temporary victory only solved part of the Empire's dilemma. There was still the constant threat of invasion from the West. The Fourth Crusade had failed to end the schism between the Churches as the Papacy had hoped it would. When the Byzantines recaptured Constantinople, a great blow had been dealt to the Papacy, and there was always the danger that the Roman pontiff would inaugurate a new attempt to take the city. Especially ambitious to lead such a campaign against the East was Charles of Anjou, Count of Provence. At the invitation of the Pope, Charles came to Italy to rid the Papacy of its hated enemy, Manfred Hohenstaufen, in exchange for the latter's Kingdom of Sicily. Once Manfred had been defeated, Charles turned his full attention to the East. Under the auspices of the Papacy, an alliance was concluded in 1267 between the former Latin Emperor of Constantinople, Baldwin II and Charles with the explicit purpose of the recapture of Constantinople. (15)

With the threat of Charles of Anjou becoming more and more apparent, Michael VIII wasted no time in making a concentrated diplomatic effort in the hope that Charles might be restrained. The object of his efforts was the current Pope, Clement IV, to whom he suggested the reinstitution of negotiations concerning Church union. This suggestion may have been unrealistic at a time when the Byzantine Church itself was divided by the Arsenite problem but it proved attractive to the Pope, although he could envisage no union except on his own terms, which he set down in writing for the Emperor's benefit. Soon afterwards, Clement died and the chair of Peter remained vacant for three years until Gregory X was elected Pope in 1271. Upon his enthronement, he announced plans for the convocation of a Church council in 1274 which would, among other matters, address itself to the union of the Churches of Rome and Constantinople. Michael once again approached the Papacy with his desire for union; in response, the Pope demanded

complete submission to the see of Rome and the Roman faith on the exact terms laid down by Clement IV before Byzantium could participate in the proposed council. (16) It was a tall order, but one which Michael could not ignore. If he did not comply, Charles of Anjou would soon attack and any hope for the preservation of the Empire would vanish.

Michael found himself trapped by paradox. If he alienated Rome, his Empire would fall before the renewed attacks of the West. If he alienated his own people by overtures to Rome the internal situation of the Empire, already plagued by the Arsenite schism would worsen. It was a choice between the lesser of two evils and the Emperor opted for submission to Rome. After the cultural and religious shock of the Fourth Crusade, the chances for union with Rome appeared very slight at Byzantium and Michael must have known this. Nonetheless he had no other choice but to attempt to persuade his people of the necessity of union between Rome and Constantinople for the good of the Empire. The very mention of the proposal elicited angry opposition in Constantinople; submission to Rome was so basically repugnant to the Byzantine frame of mind that both the zealots and the moderates of the Church could oppose it.

Byzantium had always been prepared to recognise the Pope of Rome as 'primus inter pares' among the pentarchy of Patriarchates but this reflected a precedence of honour, not authority. (17) Submission to the Papacy would mean complete refutation of the apostolic ideal of episcopal independence and equality. Also inherent in any acceptance of Papal supremacy was the adoption of alien doctrines and practices indigenous to the Western Church. Foremost among these stood the filioque, an addition made to the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed without the necessary assent of an ecumenical council. This in itself provided the basis for its rejection as far as the Byzantines were

concerned. But they also objected to its theological implications. (18)

The Arsenites, already persecuted by the Emperor for their opposition to his policies, were especially indignant concerning his plans for submission to Rome. Even the moderates of the Byzantine Church displayed dismay and outrage when they realised that the Orthodoxy of their Church would be sacrificed. Accordingly, both zealots and moderates now had a common cause for opposition to the Emperor. While not in collaboration with one another, both disapproved of any concession to the Papacy which would lead to the union of the Churches. The narrower concerns of the two religious-political parties, particularly those of the Arsenites, receded into the background as both applied their energies in opposition to the plan of union. (19)

John Bekkos, the archivist (chartophylax) of Saint Sophia, led the moderate party with the support of the Patriarch Joseph. Bekkos felt there could be no relations with the Latins since their doctrinal innovations laid them under suspicion of being heretics. Nonetheless, he announced his intention to resign rather than be the person to cause further dissensions in the Church or bring insult to the Emperor. Furious with his success in attracting supporters, Michael gave Bekkos little opportunity to do either and threw him into prison. (20)

Michael's body of support remained tiny in comparison with the mass of support his opponents had gathered. Outside of a few members of the literati, few sympathised with the Emperor's position. By the middle of 1273, after almost a year of concerted effort, the Emperor had little to show for his labours. Support for the Patriarch and the anti-unionist cause continued to grow, especially after Joseph had denounced the filioque and published an apologia and encyclical which supported resistance. (22) Gregory X's proposed council was only a year away and the inevitable invasion of Charles of Anjou loomed closer.

**PAGE
NUMBERS
CUT OFF
IN
ORIGINAL**

Well aware that little time remained to bring his plan to fruition, Michael searched for a personality who might refute the overwhelming opposition of the anti-unionists. He chose Bekkos, who still remained imprisoned for his own anti-unionist policy. A selection of Patristic passages and a treatise on the Holy Spirit by the Byzantine scholar Nikephoros Blemmydes which showed the common beliefs held by both Churches was delivered to his cell. After some time with the texts, he made a complete 'volte face' and announced that union seemed more feasible than he had first believed. (23)

Released from prison following the reversal of his position, Bekkos assumed the role of chief spokesman for the unionist cause. He managed to persuade a small number of the clergy to form a unionist party but this group never succeeded in attracting much support from the remainder of Byzantine society. Hoping to weaken the opposition, the Emperor had the Patriarch confined to a monastery, thus removing the possibility of further anti-unionist encyclicals. By early 1274, a few bishops had joined the unionist party and had written a statement of submission to the Papacy. To this was added a personal profession of the Roman faith by the Emperor and his son Andronikos. (24) The council of the Church which Gregory X had decided to convene at Lyons, in southern France, was only a few months away and little time remained for further deliberation. Alarmed by the threat of Charles of Anjou, and having no other alternative but to submit to Rome, Michael despatched members of his small unionist party, a group totally unrepresentative of Byzantium, to Lyons in order to placate the Pope and save the Empire.

The details of the second Council of Lyons are brief and uncomplicated. Following their arrival, the Byzantine party under the leadership of the Grand Logothete George Akropolites presented its documents of submission to the Pope. After swearing an oath on the

Emperor's behalf, Akropolites and his companions proclaimed their adherence to the Roman faith by reciting the Creed with the filioque addition. There were no theological discussions concerning it or any other question of doctrine at the council. (25) Rome expected full compliance without any argument and the Byzantine party showed itself quick to comply. For the moment, the Papacy appeared satisfied that the reunion of the Churches, one of the chief goals of its policies for the past two hundred years, had been realised. Michael VIII must have felt a special satisfaction, for the reunion of the Churches meant the abandonment of Charles' campaign against the Empire.

Michael's policy had fatal consequences for the internal life of the Empire. Hatred for the Latins, widespread at Byzantium since the Fourth Crusade, could not be eradicated so easily. Especially intolerable was the fact that the Emperor himself bore responsibility for the union. Byzantium felt itself betrayed except for the very small proportion of unionists who supported the Emperor. Consequently, most of the population refused to accept union with Rome. As a realistic politician, Michael knew that the survival of the Empire depended on the survival of the union. He therefore had no choice but to enforce it. Since the Patriarch Joseph continued to be such a vehement opponent of union, Michael removed him from office in May 1275 and installed Bekkos in his place. Just as the removal of Arsenios a decade earlier had caused the formation of a separatist group in the Church, the removal of Joseph produced similar results; 'Josephites' as well as Arsenites now opposed the Emperor for his patriarchal depositions as well as for his unionist policies. Joseph, in particular, became the symbol of virtuous opposition to the Emperor for non-unionists. Michael answered the opposition with widespread persecution, declaring that all anti-unionists were traitors. (26)

Imprisonment, confiscation of property, mutilation, and blinding became commonplace but these punishments only strengthened the resolve of the anti-unionists.

From 1274 to 1280, no less than five papal legations came to Constantinople to verify the endorsement of the union by the Byzantines themselves. (27) The continual turmoil between unionists and anti-unionists clearly demonstrated that the Union of Lyons had not really been accepted at Byzantium. Rome responded with increased demands of submission but Michael could not comply. His prisons were already filled and further persecution only created more martyrs to inspire the anti-unionist cause. By 1281, the Papacy realised that the union could never be implemented at Byzantium. Charles of Anjou, who still impatiently waited for the opportunity to attack the East, succeeded in having a Pope elected who would support his cause. When Martin IV secured the papal throne, he immediately announced that the schism of the Byzantines would be ended only by force. Once again, plans and alliances for the recapture of Constantinople were enacted by Charles with the Pope's blessing.

Within a year, Michael's excommunication by papal order had eliminated an important defence against the West. (28) The excommunication ended any semblance of union with Rome that remained and emphasised the recurrent threat of the West. Although he never renounced the Roman faith, the Emperor employed all of his military strength and diplomatic skill to thwart the plans of Charles and the Papacy. Frenzied negotiations and Byzantine gold procured Michael's greatest diplomatic success, that of the so-called Sicilian Vespers of 1282. Through Michael's instigation, the Sicilians overthrew the government of Charles of Anjou, destroying both his power and his hopes for the conquest of Byzantium. (29) The Empire's survival of yet another

crisis was due largely to Michael's political abilities, but he received little gratitude for his efforts. He died within months of the Sicilian Vespers, and even if he had lived, his people would probably not have found it in their hearts to forgive him for his unionist policies. When Michael died, the consequences of Lyons did not die with him; the Empire's internal peace had been completely shattered. Pachymeres noted that 'the division within Byzantium had become as profound as that which only yesterday had divided Byzantines and Latins'. (30)

Naturally, first in succession to the consequences of division was Michael's son, Andronikos. At his father's death he ascended the throne as the Emperor Andronikos II. Horrified by the division and suffering that Michael's unionist policies had caused, Andronikos quickly renounced the Union of Lyons at the suggestion of his advisors. To the anti-unionists, this act merely marked the first step in the complete removal of Latin 'contamination' from Byzantium. The Josephites rose to the occasion, forcing the Emperor to convene a council which deposed the Patriarch Bekkos and punished the other unionist clergy. The reinstatement of Joseph as Patriarch once again demonstrated that his party was in full control of the situation, but the quick deterioration of his health and a resurgence in strength among the Arsenites soon changed the course of events. (31)

With Andronikos' accession the external situation of the Empire worsened. His father's involvement with Western Europe had never allowed the former Emperor to address himself to the growing Turkish problem in Asia Minor. By the time Andronikos came to the throne, the Turkish threat had certainly increased and by the turn of the century most of Asia Minor had been lost to the Turks. The limited territory of the Empire brought economic distress due to the

inevitable decrease in resources and capital. Because of this economic decline, both the army and the navy suffered. After 1283 the navy was completely disbanded, leaving the sea routes to the exploitative whims of the Venetians and the Genoese. (32) In complete contrast, the power and influence of the Church increased even as the strength of the state weakened. Although divided into various factions, the revival of Orthodoxy following the renunciation of the Union of Lyons enabled the Church to gain virtual control of the Empire's internal situation. During the early years of his reign, all of Andronikos' energies were consumed by the problems created by the Arsenites and Josephites. As he attempted solutions to the ecclesiastical strife, the external situation of the Empire remained untended and continued to deteriorate.

In March 1283 the Patriarch Joseph died. Both the Arsenites and the Josephites expected one of their own to be elevated to the patriarchal throne. Instead, the Emperor chose a compromise candidate, the layman Gregory of Cyprus. Gregory, whose career will be examined in much greater detail below, belonged to neither of these parties. The Josephites accepted him, as did the Arsenites but only after certain concessions had been made by the Emperor to the latter group. Foremost among these concessions was the convocation of a council at Blachernai which provided the Arsenites with the opportunity to condemn their foremost enemies. But the Arsenites' recognition of the new Patriarch proved short-lived, even after the concessions granted to them. Because he had been accepted so readily by the Josephites, the party of Arsenios began to identify the Patriarch more and more with its opposition. The patriarchal party soon became the target of the Arsenites' bitterest condemnations. Once again, the Emperor took upon himself the responsibility for a solution to the problem

by calling all the opponents together at Adramyttion in early 1284 for a council designed to reconcile the Arsenites with the Patriarch. It succeeded in bringing only a small number of Arsenites into the official Church, however. The remainder were excommunicated. (33)

Shortly after the deliberations at Adramyttion, a new problem arose at Constantinople. John Bekkos, the former unionist Patriarch who had been deposed and sent into exile the previous year, demanded a new trial. Such a public sensation was caused by his demand that the Patriarch and the Emperor had to give their assent to the convocation of yet another council. Bekkos was brought from exile at the beginning of 1285 and tried at the Second Council of Blachernai. Defending the Latin doctrine of the filioque, the former Patriarch scandalised his judges by basing his defense upon various Fathers of the Eastern Church. Condemning Bekkos because of his heretical views, the council also pronounced the first authoritative conciliar repudiation of the Latin filioque. It requested that Gregory of Cyprus write the tomos or conciliar declaration against the views of Bekkos. Rather than resolve the problem, the Patriarch's treatise only aggravated it and Byzantium was thrown into a theological upheaval concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit. Many attacked Gregory's tomos as innovative and therefore heretical, and the Patriarch was eventually forced to resign in 1289, after nearly four years of turmoil. (34)

During the pneumatological controversies, the Arsenites continued to stir up trouble in Constantinople with their demands for the Patriarch's removal. With Gregory's resignation, however, some of them turned their attention to the Emperor himself. John Tarchaniotes, Andronikos' cousin and an Arsenite, was discovered with various imperial insignia and some of the crown jewels in his possession and

arrested for conspiracy. Despite such threats to his authority, the Emperor constantly made new concessions to the Arsenites. He offered them the Monastery of Mosele in Constantinople for their private devotions, but it eventually became more a focal point for the dissemination of Arsenite propaganda than a spiritual centre. (35) In the midst of the problems caused by the Arsenites, Andronikos chose for the patriarchate another person who had no association with either of the religious-political parties. The hermit Athanasios was elevated to the patriarchal throne in late 1289 and immediately a vast program of ecclesiastical reform that had the sacrifice of much of the Church's wealth and the moral laxity of the Byzantine clergy as its principal objectives was instituted. Such a programme alienated the Constantinopolitan clergy, and they demanded that the Emperor pressure the Patriarch to resign. (36) Athanasios I resigned the patriarchate in late 1293 but his place was taken by John XII who only continued the reforms of his predecessor. John came to disagreement with Andronikos, and this gave the Emperor the opportunity to return Athanasios to the patriarchal throne. In 1303, Athanasios re-assumed the patriarchate although another year passed before the Emperor convinced the hierarchy to accept him. (37)

During the second patriarchate of Athanasios, the Arsenites displayed their last burst of activity at Constantinople. Their protest had already gone on for forty years and their numbers had grown smaller, but they still possessed enough strength to create trouble. They continued to cause disturbances in the capital, and in desperation the Emperor posted armed guards outside the Monastery of Mosele. In the winter of 1305, a plot against the Emperor led by John Drimys, who claimed to be a descendent of the Laskarids, was discovered in the city. It appeared that the conspiracy had its

origin in the Arsenite monastery and that many Arsenites were involved in it. The evictions from the city and the arrests that followed deprived the Arsenites of much of their manpower. (38)

When Athanasios resigned the patriarchate and retired to a monastery in 1309, he was succeeded by Niphon, bishop of Kyzikos. Taking advantage of the advanced weakness of the Arsenite party, Niphon made a determined effort to end the Arsenite schism once and for all. In 1310 the Arsenites were reconciled with the official Church through an ingenious document that made it possible for them to end their schism without sacrificing their principles. It was announced that neither Athanasios I nor John XII, who had never been recognised by the Arsenites, would be permitted to occupy the patriarchate again. The name of Patriarch Joseph I was erased from the diptychs, but it was added that such action would have gratified the humble prelate. (39) Even if the agreement of 1310 had not succeeded, the Arsenites did not have the strength to survive much longer. Their movement was now out-of-date and could find little support anywhere. After their reconciliation to the Church, a few Arsenites broke with the agreement and refused to accept the official Church once again. With their deaths, the movement completely disappeared, only to be replaced by new social, civil and ecclesiastical disorders that marked the final demise of the Byzantine state. (40)

In retrospect, two principles of political motivation ran through late thirteenth-century Byzantium. Fear of the West, caused by the Fourth Crusade and its aftermath accounted for the first while the reaction to Michael Palaiologos' usurpation caused the second. Long after the expulsion of the Latins from Constantinople and Michael's usurpation were accomplished facts, both events continued to affect developments within the Empire. Michael's union of the Churches and his part in the Sicilian Vespers were manifestations of Byzantium's

fear of the West as well as solutions to pressing problems. Likewise, the hostilities of the Arsenites and the Josephites could be traced to political loyalties associated with the aftermath of Michael's seizure of the throne. This does not mean that these groups possessed no religious motives but the Laskarid sympathies of the Arsenites and the recognition of Michael by the Josephites were of primary importance to each group's identity. When the Josephites could no longer support Michael because of his unionist policies, they waited until his son denounced those policies. Only then would they recognise the new Emperor. Meanwhile, the Arsenites recognised John IV Laskaris as the only legitimate ruler. (41)

Despite the neat classifications of unionist/anti-unionist, zealot/moderate, and Arsenite/Josephite during this half century of turmoil, party identifications were not always distinct. Characteristic were those who embraced both the unionist and the anti-unionist ideal at different times. Especially noteworthy in this group was Gregory of Cyprus, the principal figure in what follows below. Whether these people were waverers or just politically astute can be debated but it should be mentioned that many were transformed from unionists to anti-unionists even as the throne passed from Michael VIII to Andronikos II. (42) To add to the confusion, the Arsenites experienced splinter parties. One such group reconciled itself to the official Church a generation before the agreement of 1310. (43)

When Andronikos II ascended the throne, the milieu of circumstances remained much the same as those of his father's reign. Although the new Emperor renounced the Union of Lyons, the growing distrust of the West at Byzantium brought a backlash of reaction against unionism. The conflicting loyalties of the Arsenites and Josephites continued. Michael

was dead but his heir now occupied the throne, unrecognised by the Arsenites. Both Josephites and Arsenites clamored that their respective candidates be made Patriarch. (44) This was the situation when Gregory of Cyprus became Patriarch of Constantinople and it should be remembered that it was developing even as he grew up.

Notes - Chapter One

- (1) Pachymeres I, pp. 54-67; Angold pp. 80-83; Geanakoplos pp. 39-54; Nicol p. 35.
- (2) Arsenios Autoreianos, Testamentum, MPG 140, c. 952; Pachymeres I, pp. 102-3; Angold pp. 83-90; Geanakoplos pp. 45-46; Sykoutres 2, pp. 277-280; Troitskij pp. 27-30. Concerning Arsenios and the Arsenites cf. also S. Eustratiades, 'Ο πατριάρχης Ἀρσένιος ὁ Ἀυτορειανός', Ἑλληνικά, 1(1928), pp. 78-94. V. Laurent 'Les grandes crises religieuses à Byzance: La fin du schisme arsénite', Académie Roumaine-Bulletin de la section historique 26(1945), pp. 225-313; L. Petit 'Arsène Autorianus et les Arsénites' DTC 1, ii, cc. 1991-4; and J. Roussos The Arsenites, an unpublished doctoral thesis, Oxford.
- (3) Akropolites I, p. 186; Troitskij p. 42.
- (4) Akropolites I, p. 187; Angold p. 91; Sykoutres 2, p. 288.
- (5) Pachymeres I, pp. 111-119; Angold pp. 90-91; Sykoutres 2, pp. 280-288; Troitskij pp. 42-47.
- (6) Arsenios Autoreianos, Testamentum, MPG 140, c. 954; Pachymeres I, pp. 169-174; Angold p. 91; Sykoutres 2, pp. 288-289; Troitskij pp. 42-47.
- (7) Pachymeres I, pp. 191-192, 203; Angold p. 92; Troitskij pp. 50-56.
- (8) Pachymeres I, p. 204, pp. 270-271; Angold p. 92; Sykoutres 2, pp. 298-301; Troitskij p. 87. The council chose the 7th Apostolic Canon - A bishop charged must be questioned by other bishops; if he does not appear, let him be deposed. Cf. G.A. Rhalles and M. Potles, Σύνταγμα (Athens, 1852-9), 2, pp. 93-94.
- (9) Pachymeres I, pp. 306-307; Sykoutres 2, p. 309. According to V. Grumel 'La Chronologie', Traité d'Etudes Byzantines 1(1928), p. 437, the reign of Germanos III is dated 25 May 1265 -

14 September 1266 while that of Joseph I is 28 December 1266 - May 1275.

- (10) The term 'religious-political party' has been suggested by Vasiliev p. 659.
- (11) Ostrogorsky pp. 178-179. For a description of the two parties in late thirteenth century Byzantium cf. Gregoras I, p. 165 and Pachymeres I, p. 280.
- (12) Compare Angold's explanation for the rise of the Arsenites, Angold pp. 56-59, with those of Troitskij, quoted in Vasiliev pp. 661-662.
- (13) For the difficulty of conciliation with the Arsenites in Asia Minor see Pachymeres I, pp. 337-342, 483-491, 502-503, II pp. 88-89; Gregoras I, p. 127; V. Laurent op. cit. n. 2, pp. 225-238.
- (14) Pachymeres I, p. 215; Geanakoplos pp. 180-181; Ostrogorsky p. 453.
- (15) Geanakoplos pp. 189-200; Ostrogorsky pp. 452, 455.
- (16) Geanakoplos pp. 200-206, 237-245; Nicol pp. 54-57.
- (17) For the concept of the pentarchy contrasted with Roman authority cf. especially Theodore the Studite Epistolarum Liber II, 15 and 63, MPG 99 cc. 161AB and 281B, quoted in J. Meyendorff Byzantine Theology (English edition: Oxford, 1975), pp. 57-58; see also Barker p. 88.
- (18) On the filioque and the problem of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, chapter five.
- (19) Vasiliev pp. 662-663.
- (20) Gregoras I, pp. 127-128; Pachymeres I, pp. 376-378; D.M. Nicol 'The Greeks and the Union of the Churches: The Preliminaries to the Second Council of Lyons 1261-1274' Byzantium: Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World (London, 1972), article 5, pp. 466-467.

- (21) Gregoras I, p. 130; Pachymeres I, p. 374. Prominent in this group of sympathisers was Gregory of Cyprus.
- (22) G. Metochites I, pp. 38, 40; Pachymeres I, pp. 378-380, 382; Sykoutres 2, pp. 308, 311, 317. On Joseph, cf. L. Petit 'Joseph le Galesiote', DTC 8, ii(1925), cc. 1541-2. On his apologia, cf. the text in J. Dräseke 'Der Kircheneinigungsversuch des Kaisers Michael VIII Paläologos' Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie 34(1891), pp. 332-335, and the text of the encyclical and comments of V. Laurent 'Le serment anti-Latin du Patriarche Joseph I (Juin 1273)', EO 26(1927), pp. 396-407.
- (23) Gregoras I, pp. 128-130; Pachymeres I, pp. 381-383; Nicol pp. 58-9; N. Blemmydes De Processione, MKG 142 cc. 533-584. A vast literature concerning Bekkos and his thought has accumulated. Basic are: G. Hofman 'Patriarch Johann Bekkos und die lateinische Kultur', OCP 11(1945), pp. 141-164; V. Laurent 'Le cas de Photius dans le apologetique du patriarche Jean XI Beccos', EO 29(1930), pp. 396-415; L. Petit 'Jean Beccos ou Jean XI', DTC 8, i(1924), cc. 356-360; R. Souarn 'Tentatives d'union avec Rome: Un patriarche grec catholique au XIII siècle (Jean Vekkos)', EO 3(1899-1900), pp. 229-237, 351-361; A.D. Zotos, 'Ιωάννης ὁ Βέκκος κατὰ τὴν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως νέας Πάσης ὁ λατινόφωνον' (Munich, 1920) and also passim in Evert-Kappesowa in n. 25 below.
- (24) Pachymeres I, pp. 384-395, describes the events leading up to the departure of the unionists for Lyons.
- (25) Pachymeres I, pp. 395-396, describes the trip of the Byzantine delegation; Geanakoplos pp. 258-264; D.M. Nicol 'The Byzantine Reaction to Lyons', Byzantium: Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World (London, 1972), article 5, p. 114. Among the works on Lyons not cited here are B. Roberg

Die Union zwischen der griechischen und der lateinischen Kirche auf dem II Konzil von Lyon (Bonn, 1964); S. Runciman The Sicilian Vespers (Cambridge, 1958); H. Evert-Kappesowa 'La société byzantine et l'Union de Lyon', BS 10(1949), pp. 28-41; 'Une page de l'histoire des relations byzantines-latines. Le clergé byzantin et l'Union de Lyon (1274-1282)', BS 13(1952), pp. 68-92; 'Byzance et le St. Siège à l'époque de l'union de Lyon', BS 16(1955), pp. 297-317; J. Gill 'The Church Union of the Council of Lyons (1274) Portrayed in Greek Documents', OCP 40(1974), pp. 5-45; V. Grumel 'Le deuxième Concile de Lyon et la reunion de l'église grecque', DTC 3, ii(1907), cc. 1391-1410; V. Laurent and J. Darrouzès Dossier grec de l'union de Lyon (1273-77), (Paris, 1976), and K.M. Setton, The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571), I, (Philadelphia, 1976), esp. pp. 106-139.

- (26) Pachymeres I, p. 395; Nicol p. 67.
- (27) Vasiliev p. 659.
- (28) Geanakoplos pp. 340-42; Nicol pp. 71-2.
- (29) Cf. Michael's own boast of his successful part in the Sicilian Vespers in his own autobiography, quoted in Geanakoplos p. 367.
- (30) Pachymeres I, p. 401.
- (31) Pachymeres II, pp. 11-39.
- (32) Pachymeres II, pp. 153-65; the fate of the navy: Pachymeres II, pp. 69-70; Nicol pp. 130-131, 114-115, 105-106; Ostrogorsky p. 487. Andronikos did not even concern himself with Asia Minor until 1290 when he paid a visit there which lasted three years.
- (33) Pachymeres II, pp. 42-64.
- (34) Pachymeres II, pp. 88-102, 108-134.
- (35) Pachymeres II, pp. 593; Nicol p. 105; Janin p. 359.
- (36) Pachymeres II, pp. 140, 146-152, 166-178; Gregoras I, pp. 180-182, 185-186, 191. For more on Athanasios cf. M. Banescu 'Le patriarche

Athanase I et Andronic II Paléologue: état religieux, politique, et social de l'Empire', Académie Roumaine-Bulletin de la section historique 22(1942), pp. 1-28; J. Gill 'Emperor Andronikos II and Patriarch Athanasios I', Byzantina 2(1970), pp. 13-19; R. Guillard 'La correspondance inédite d'Athanase, patriarche de Constantinople', Mélanges Ch. Diehl 1(1930), pp. 121-140; V. Laurent 'Le serment de l'empereur Andronic II Paléologue au patriarche Athanase Ier lors de sa seconde accession au trône oecuménique (Sept, 1303)', REB 23(1965), pp. 124-139; K.P. Matschke 'Politik und Kirche im spätbyzantinischen Reich; Athanasios I Patriarch von Konstantinopel 1289-1293, 1303-1309', Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift Universität Leipzig 15(1966), pp. 479-486; A.M.M. Talbot The Correspondence of Athanasios I (Washington, 1975); idem 'The Patriarch Athanasios I and the Church', DOP 27(1973), pp. 13-28; and passim. J. Meyendorff 'Spiritual Trends in Byzantium in the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries', Art et Société pp. 53-71 (=Kariye Djami 4, pp. 95-106) Also, an unpublished dissertation on the personality of Athanasios has been written by J. Boojamra, Fordham University. Two lives of Athanasios have survived, one by Theoktistos Studites, published in part by H. Delehaye, École Française de Rome-Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire 17(1897) and in full by A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Zapiski istorikofilologicheskago fakul'teta Imperatorskago S Petersburgskago Universiteta 76(1905), p. 151, and another by Joseph Kalothetos ed. A. Pantocratorinus Θαυμάσια 13(1940), pp. 59-107.

- (37) Pachymeres II, resignation of Athanasios pp. 184-187; reign of John pp. 337-343; reinstatement of Athanasios pp. 368-377, 379-384; his complete recognition pp. 409-410.

- (38) Pachymeres II, p. 593; Nicol p. 110.
- (39) Gregoras I, p. 262; Nicol pp. 110-111. The documents of the Council of 1310 will be found in V. Laurent, op.cit. n. 2, pp. 295-311.
- (40) For the events and personalities following the Council of 1310, cf. J. Darrouzes Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine (Paris, 1966), texts of J. Cheilas pp. 86-106, 348-413; J. Gouillard 'Après le schisme arsenite - La correspondance de pseudo Jean Chilas', Académie Roumaine-Bulletin de la section historique 25(1944), pp. 1-20; V. Laurent 'Le schisme anti-arsenite du métropolitain de Philadelphie Théolepte (c. 1324)' REB 18(1960), pp. 45-54.
- (41) Pachymeres II, p. 39, mentions that the Arsenites believed that Joseph was excommunicated by Arsenios, implying that Andronikos' coronation was invalid.
- (42) Compare Pachymeres I, p. 374, and Pachymeres II, p. 25.
- (43) Pachymeres II, p. 64.
- (44) Pachymeres II, pp. 14-42.

II. Gregory's Early Life (1241-1273)

Gregory of Cyprus, as his name implies, was born on the island of Cyprus about the year 1241. (1) At the time of his birth, Cyprus no longer constituted a part of the Byzantine Empire, however. As early as the late twelfth century, the great nephew of the Emperor Manuel I, Isaac Komnenos, had established himself as ruler of the island, making it independent of the Empire. During the course of the Crusades, Richard the Lionheart took possession of the island after imprisoning Isaac, but he found it a drain upon his energies and resources and sold it to the Knights Templar in 1191. After only a year on Cyprus, the Templars likewise sold the island to Guy de Lusignan, the former Frankish King of Jerusalem, and it thenceforth remained in Western hands. (2)

Following Guy's death, his family continued to rule Cyprus, but while the Lusignan court grew in prosperity, the Cypriot population fell into poverty which resulted from the exploitation and oppression of the Franks. At the end of the twelfth century, St. Neophytos and others wrote grim words describing the hardships of the Cypriots. (3) Under the Frankish occupation, the population evidently suffered to such an extent that many preferred to abandon their remaining possessions than live under alien rule. By the mid-thirteenth century, many of the barons of the Kingdom of Jerusalem had come to Cyprus to seek their fortune after the loss of their lands in Syria. They confiscated both the land and the wealth of the natives. (4)

Among those who suffered indignities at the hands of the Franks but still remained on the island was the family of Gregory of Cyprus. Opinion once held that Gregory's family was of Italian descent but in his autobiography, the only document of Gregory's early life which we possess, he makes it quite clear that his family was well-established

on the island and had lived there for a very long time although he does not specify where. (5) Previous to the advent of the English and the French, the Cypriots had had few visits from Westerners with the exception of a few Italian traders. (6) That Gregory's family was descended from them seems unlikely in light of his insistence upon his Cypriot (or rather Greek) ancestry. He mentions the enslavement of this portion of the Greek world by foreigners and the indignities of oppression which everyone suffered in common, revealing at the same time a great distaste for those who had brought misery to his homeland. (7)

Gregory does not dwell upon the Frankish domination of Cyprus at length, but returns to the narration of his own life's story and its overriding aspect: his attempts to secure a good education. In the thirteenth century, the acquisition of an education on Cyprus was difficult task. The Orthodox Church of Cyprus and its monasteries were the only institutions on the island that had provided education for the people, but these suffered severe restrictions after 1222. Orthodox bishops could not ordain without permission of the Latin archbishop of Nikosia and the number of monks permitted in each monastery depended on the decision of the Latin archbishop. (8) In 1248, the Latin archbishop of Nikosia opened two free schools in his cathedral to help fill the gap in educational facilities. One of these was an elementary school devoted to a faculty of grammar, the other specifically designed for the teaching of theology. (9)

At first, Gregory was raised by his parents. Showing a great ability for learning, they sent him to Nikosia at the age of nine to enter a school there. Even in the capital itself there were almost no teachers among the Greeks and the newly opened school of the Latin archbishop seemed the only alternative. He enrolled in the 'Roman school'

(or, as he termed it in Greek, παιδευτήρια 'Ρωμαίων, at Nikosia but immediately encountered language difficulties. According to Gregory, the language used at the school was ἡ ἀρχαία Λατίνων γωνή.(10) The language situation on Cyprus had evolved from the simple usage of Greek and Syrian during Byzantine sovereignty to a complex amalgam of various languages which resulted from the visits of invaders and pilgrims but Latin must have been the vehicle for instruction at the archbishop's school. (11) For some reason, the medium remained largely inaccessible to Gregory and he makes mention that he could grasp only the rudiments of subjects such as Aristotelian logic because of the language problem. Exhausted from his struggles with Latin, he returned home at the age of fifteen, very distressed that his education had made so little progress. (12)

During his time in Nikosia, Gregory probably heard stories of the education and scholarship which flourished at Nicaea. Even as he studied in the Cypriot capital, the Emperor Theodore II Laskaris was gathering scholars around him at the seat of his Empire-in-exile. According to Gregory, 'of Nicaea, the travellers say that they imagine themselves to have returned to ancient Athens, so great is the number of wise men you will find there'. (13) Such tales captivated him and he concluded that he must go to Nicaea if he hoped to receive a good education. In light of his age, Gregory's parents did not share his enthusiasm for making such a trip, and two years passed before he finally set out for the city where he hoped his aspirations would be fulfilled (1258-59). First, he travelled by boat to Ptolemais (Acre) in Palestine and then sailed on to Ephesos through rather difficult weather. At Ephesos, he decided to see Nikephoros Blemmydes (1197-1272), the great Nicaean scholar. (14)

Twice a candidate for the patriarchate, Blemmydes' lifelong concern had been the acquisition of knowledge. (15) Because of the almost total absence of higher education in the Nicaean Empire, he had to travel from town to town to gain his education. In addition to his studies at Brusa and Smyrna, he even went to Latin-occupied Troad (Scamandros) to complete his education. (16) Engaged in many scholarly activities throughout his life, Blemmydes eventually gained the reputation as the greatest scholar in the Empire and opened a school at the Monastery of St. Gregory the Wonderworker at Ephesos. Here, the Emperor of Nicaea sent pupils to study philosophy, providing Blemmydes with funds for this purpose. The arrangement failed because of bad relations with some of his students and he refused to accept further pupils from the Emperor. Blemmydes had established his own monastery by the time Gregory arrived in Ephesos but the young Cypriot never saw it nor its founder. Gregory was greeted with disdain and distrust by the people of Ephesos. Being poor and a foreigner, they had no need of him. Besides, Blemmydes would not have tolerated the intrusion of such a youngster into his retreat. (18)

Suffering yet another disappointment, Gregory continued on to Nicaea. He had run out of money, so it was necessary for him to make the journey from Ephesos to Nicaea by foot during the winter of 1260. When he reached the vicinity of Nicaea, probably in the spring, he came upon an encamped army which inspired him to look among its ranks for a wealthy patron who would support his academic career in Nicaea. Not having immediate success in this endeavour, he stayed with the army for some time, crossed the Hellespont with it, and marched through Thrace with it until it reached Latin-dominated Constantinople. (19) This force, evidently that of the Emperor of Nicaea himself, had hoped to capture the city from the Latins but failed. All indications show

that the events which Gregory had witnessed at Constantinople were those of the unsuccessful campaign of Nicaea against the Latins in the spring of 1260. (20) Following the Byzantine failure, Gregory returned to Nicaea with great expectations for the continuation of his studies.

With the destruction of the educational system at Constantinople by the Fourth Crusade, the Empire of Nicaea had to begin practically from scratch. From the early years of exile, elementary schooling (ἐγκύχλιος παιδεία) probably continued to survive in the cities of western Asia Minor but higher studies, previously concentrated at Constantinople, vanished. Blemmydes' own trip outside the Empire confirms this. John Vatatzes and Theodore II Laskaris attempted to rectify the situation by founding libraries, by becoming patrons of scholars, and by ordering the collection and copying of manuscripts. (21) Vatatzes sent pupils to private instructors such as Blemmydes but there was no imperial school until the reign of Theodore II Laskaris. He founded a school at the Church of St. Tryphon in Nicaea where he established chairs of grammar and rhetoric. (22) The troubles caused by the death of Theodore in 1258 may have brought disorganisation to his school and to education in general at Nicaea. When Gregory arrived there, he soon learned that the overwhelming tales of its scholarship had been grossly inflated. He mentions that some instruction in grammar and rhetoric was available but most other subjects were treated superficially if at all. Filled with disbelief that he had come so far and that he had actually risked his life for almost no purpose, he experienced the greatest despair of his life. A return home was out of the question since he had no money and only the recapture of Constantinople in 1261 brought a solution to his dilemma. (23)

After the Byzantine recapture of Constantinople, the Emperor

Michael VIII decided that the tradition of higher education at Constantinople should be revived. Like his predecessors, he was well aware that the renewed Empire required literate diplomatic and civil services; in order to provide these, he promoted educational establishments. (24) Whether the general term 'university' could be applied to his establishment for higher education proves as debatable as the rather elusive character of the so-called university at Constantinople prior to the Fourth Crusade. This institution had served the utilitarian purpose of providing statesmen, diplomats and jurists over the centuries as well as scholars. (25)

If recent research suggests a less centralised system of higher education in Constantinople at various times, it remains obvious that imperial support of education was a Byzantine tradition. (26) Perhaps Emperors often supported individual professors rather than an institution, as during the Empire of Nicaea. Before the Latin conquest, some professors probably 'freelanced' and taught in places of their own choosing. Because of the obvious lack of qualified instructors during the Byzantine diaspora of the thirteenth century, well testified by the complaints of Gregory of Cyprus at Nicaea, a large gathering of scholars at Constantinople following its recapture appears unlikely. Blemmydes, the foremost scholar of the period, remained at Ephesos but his former pupil George Akropolites (1217-1282) came to Constantinople and took charge of the new program of education at the Emperor's direction. (27) Born in Latin occupied Constantinople, Akropolites had gone to Nicaea in his youth where the Emperor John Vatatzes patronised him. (28) He attended the course in philosophy which Blemmydes had taught and later became a teacher of Theodore II Laskaris. Impressed with his abilities, Theodore made him Grand Logothete in 1255, a position he continued to hold under Michael VIII while teaching at Constantinople. (29)

The revival of higher learning at Constantinople finally gave Gregory the educational opportunity he had sought. Enrolling in the course of studies, he found Akropolites a masterful instructor who deserved only the highest praise. According to Gregory, Akropolites was equally expert in guiding his pupils through the labyrinths of Aristotle and in expounding the theorems of Euclid and Nicomachos. Of all philosophers, he held Aristotle in the highest esteem and permitted only the purest Attic Greek in exercises. (30) Because we still lack a comprehensive study of the curricula of Byzantine schools, both those offering ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία and those providing higher learning, difficulties arise in making a comparison of Akropolites' curriculum with previous Byzantine practice. Much of Byzantium's educational life has been squeezed into the concepts of the trivium (basically grammar, rhetoric, and philosophy) and the quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy). Roman schools usually followed a curriculum based on the seven liberal arts and it has been suggested that this approach must have been adopted at early Byzantium and continued. (31) The trivium (with a heavy emphasis on grammar) did become synonymous with ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία at Byzantium but the quadrivium took various forms and titles. (32)

Gregory lists philosophy, rhetoric, geometry, and physics as the subjects Akropolites taught. (33) Philosophy had always been an important part of the curriculum in higher learning at Byzantium but Gregory makes specific reference to the prominence of Aristotle in the course. After the reaction against Platonism in the late eleventh century, Aristotle became the preferred philosopher at Constantinople and Akropolites continued this preference. (34) This does not mean that he discarded Plato completely; he was studied but remained subservient. (35) Rhetoric was taught in conjunction

with philosophy, much as Psellos had done but it was Aristotle who was usually emulated. The mathematical sciences included arithmetic and geometry, using Nicomachos and Euclid respectively as guides. Physics also owed its presentation to Aristotle.

Despite his enthusiasm, Gregory experienced many problems as a student at Constantinople. Because of the poor quality of his earlier education, a fact he readily admitted, his early years at Constantinople required intensive study. He had not received a comprehensive course in the ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία, the basic education every Byzantine was expected to possess before he entered higher studies. Although he proved himself an able student, his backwardness in rhetoric often made him the object of derision by the better educated students. A determined application of his abilities to the curriculum changed the situation, and his work soon attained a certain notoriety, however. Many of his compositions were displayed as models of their kind, and his reputation grew. (36)

In his autobiography, Gregory mentions that he attended school at Constantinople between the ages of twenty-six and thirty-three. (37) This would mean that he did not begin his studies under Akropolites until about the year 1267, some six years after the recapture of Constantinople. Since a definite date has yet to be suggested for the beginning of Akropolites' tenure as instructor, it might be assumed that this occurred about the same time. Gregory's overriding priority had always been the acquisition of a good education and he was always vigilant to fulfill that priority. If the course of Akropolites had been offered earlier, it might be assumed that Gregory would have taken advantage of it sooner. During the interim period of 1261-66/67, roughly from his twentieth to his twenty-sixth birthdays, Gregory probably attempted to earn a living for himself at

Constantinople. There is a brief but possible allusion to this period in the autobiography itself. 'Due to my poverty', mentions Gregory, 'I became a copier of manuscripts to satisfy my own love of books'. (38) He might mean that he copied books for himself but the duties of a scribe may have provided him with the opportunity to earn money as well as read before and during the period of his studies at Constantinople. (39)

Because of the tradition of separate lay and religious schools at Byzantium, the re-establishment of higher religious education also became a necessity after the recapture of the city. (40) Prior to the Fourth Crusade, the patriarchal school had provided the theological curriculum but we possess no comprehensive history of it although it probably existed from an early date. Through the centuries, references to it increase, especially from the decline of the 'university' in the eleventh century. (41) This does not mean the patriarchal school replaced the university entirely but with the strong reaction against pagan philosophy and neo-Platonism in particular, the Church naturally gained the upper hand. Previously, the two institutions had remained distinct; after 1082, the presence of ecclesiastics in both is common. Even though the patriarchal school had always offered secular and religious education to its students, its infiltration into the secular institutions of learning is apparent if somewhat ambiguous. (42)

The ambiguity of the situation prior to 1204 reappears at post-Latin conquest Constantinople as well. In 1266 the Patriarch Germanos III, instigated the appointment of the former imperial secretary Manuel Holobolos to a teaching position at the Church of St. Paul in the Orphanotropheion. His appointment, the date of which approximates the inception of Akropolites' course, has caused great debate as to whether or not it marks the re-establishment of the patriarchal school. (43)

The passage in Pachymeres which describes Holobolos' appointment interestingly enough also includes a mention of Akropolites. Concerned with the revival of learning, the Patriarch demands that an ecclesiastic be appointed to teach the clergy and the Emperor decrees the appointment of Holobolos. At the time of Holobolos' appointment, Michael VIII also mentions the name of Akropolites who is to teach τὰ μαθήματα. Although the passage is not precise, it seems to imply that Akropolites' students would be non-ecclesiastical, while Holobolos' would be only ecclesiastical. (44)

Both Holobolos' appointment at the instigation of the Patriarch and his possession of the title ῥήτωρ τῶν ῥητόρων suggest that it was a patriarchal school of sorts which was re-established. (45) Obviously, the institution at Constantinople of a new course for the training of clerics was a necessity. In addition to the orations Holobolos gave at court and at St. Sophia, his title denoted something more. Since the late eleventh century it meant that its holder held a position at the patriarchal school with the three teachers of the Gospels, Epistles, and Psalter. (46) If the school suffered from the shortage of instructors prevalent at Constantinople after 1261, Holobolos may have held some of these positions simultaneously and possibly directed the institution. (47)

What relationship Holobolos' school shared with that of Akropolites remains undocumented. Gregory keeps absolute silence about the new patriarchal school and speaks only of Akropolites in reference to the revival of learning under Michael Palaiologos. The curriculum which Akropolites taught was philosophy-oriented, comparable to that of secular higher education before the Fourth Crusade. As professor of philosophy and head of the school, Akropolites filled the role of ὑπατος τῶν φιλοσόφων although he never used this title. From at

least the time of Leo the Mathematician, the professor of philosophy headed the 'university'. The title, 'consul of the philosophers' originated with the tenure of Psellos and its use continued through the period of the Empire-in-exile. (48) Contrasted with Holobolos, Akropolites' teaching role remained fully secular; he was a layman appointed by the Emperor and 'consul of the philosophers' in all but title. Holobolos was a deacon appointed at the instigation of the Patriarch and 'rhetor of rhetors', a position associated with St. Sophia.

The distinct difference between these positions and the passage from Pachymeres does not preclude the possibility of a joint educational programme between the two schools. Since both institutions began at approximately the same time during a shortage of qualified instructors at Byzantium, a common faculty is not an impossibility. Students may have frequented both schools as sometimes occurred before the Fourth Crusade. (49) We still do not know the location of Akropolites' school; could it have shared quarters with that of Holobolos? Because of the profound theological learning that Gregory of Cyprus displayed in his later life, there is every likelihood that he received some theological training during his six years of study at Constantinople. (50) Although he mentions only the 'humanist' aspect of his education, his profound interest in the union of the Churches at the end of his studies and the formidable pneumatological compositions of his future patriarchate reflect more than the abilities of an amateur theologian. His future associations with Holobolos tend to confirm that he actually studied under the Rhetor's guidance and influence during this period. (51)

Gregory's early years at Constantinople witnessed the attempts to reinstate both secular and theological education to some semblance

of their former excellence. Higher education at Constantinople during the reign of Michael VIII was a rare privilege that only a very small minority enjoyed. (52) That Gregory was included in this elite indicates the open nature of Byzantine society even after the trauma of the Latin occupation--here, a penniless unknown received the opportunity to improve his education because of his own abilities. It was a difficult task to revive the educational institutions of the past; shortage of instructors and lack of money were only two of the more obvious problems. While higher education was being re-established at Constantinople, the Arsenite movement grew, possessed with an inherent distrust of secular education. Although there was no outward tension, the memories of past struggles between the 'outer' and 'inner' learning remained. (53) Those devoted to the revival, among whom Gregory of Cyprus held a prominent place, continued unabated. Gregory himself personified the unity and continuity of the Byzantine educational tradition. The Fourth Crusade had nearly obliterated that tradition with the exception of a few scattered scholars. Gregory's devotion brought his promotion from student to teacher at the end of his six years of study, and as such he fell heir to the line of Blemmydes and Akropolites.

Notes - Chapter Two

- (1) There is no place where the birthdate of Gregory of Cyprus is actually given; the approximate date of 1241 is a result of information presented in Gregory's autobiography. When he speaks of important events in his later life, he sometimes gives his age. Correlating these instances with contemporary events that are dated and counting backwards, the approximate date is reached.
- (2) Hill 2, pp. 34, 37.
- (3) Cf. Hill 2, pp. 6-7.
- (4) Hill 2, p. 137.
- (5) Autobiography c. 20A. Both F. Cayré, DTC 6 c. 1321, and S.G. Papadopoulos, 14 c. 731, make reference to the mistaken ethnic identity of Gregory although I have not found it mentioned in any primary sources. It may stem from a passage such as Gregoras I, p. 165, ll. 13-17 which implies the possibility of Gregory's deep collusion with Latins on Cyprus. With the passage of time, this 'collusion' and Gregory's unionist period may have contributed to the error of his ethnicity. The autobiography of Gregory of Cyprus has been popular with translators and commentators. It has been translated into French by W. Lameere, La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre (Brussels, 1937), pp. 176-191, and into Russian by I. Troitskij, CC 50, Part 2 (1870), pp. 164-177. The commentaries include A. Garzya, 'Observations sur l'Autobiographie de Grégoire de Chypre', Πρακτικά τοῦ Πρώτου Διεθνoῦς Κυπριολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου 2 (Leucosia, 1972) (= A. Garzya, Storia e interpretazione de Testi bizantini, article 12 (London, 1974)); J. Irmscher, 'Autobiographien in der byzantinischen Literatur', Studia Byzantina 2 (Berlin, 1973), p. 5; and G. Misch, Die Schriftsteller-

- Autobiographie und Bildungsgeschichte eines Patrarchen von Konstantinopel aus dem XIII Jahrhundert', Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts 21(1931), pp. 1-16.
- (6) Hill 2, p. 7.
 - (7) Autobiography c. 20A. As often in Byzantine authors, Gregory uses the term 'Italians' when referring to the Franks.
 - (8) Ed. J.L. LaMonte, Register of the Cartulary of Nicosia, B 5, (1929-30), no. 23 and the confirmation no. 24, Hill 3, p. 1046. For the relations between the Orthodox Church of Cyprus and the Empire of Nicaea in these circumstances, see Angold pp. 17-19.
 - (9) P. Labbé, Sacrosancta concilia (Paris 1670-2), vol. 11, ii, c. 2401, article 2; Hill p. 1067.
 - (10) Autobiography c. 21AB; Hill 3, p. 1068, n. 1.
 - (11) Hill 2, p. 5 and see his argument, 3, p. 1068, n. 3.
 - (12) Autobiography c. 21C.
 - (13) op. cit. c. 21D.
 - (14) op. cit. c. 21AB.
 - (15) Blemmydes pp. 38-39, 41-45; Angold p. 164.
 - (16) Blemmydes pp. 4-6; Angold p. 178; Bréhier pp. 402-403.
 - (17) Blemmydes pp. 29-32; Angold p. 179.
 - (18) Autobiography c. 24B. Angold pp. 32-33, attributes Gregory's rejection not only to his poverty but also to the xenophobia of the Nicaean Empire.
 - (19) Autobiography c 24CD.
 - (20) For the siege, cf. Pachymeres I, pp. 118-119, 122-124, Akropolites I, p. 173.
 - (21) Blemmydes pp. 33-34, 36-37; Angold pp. 178-179; Bréhier pp. 400-402.
 - (22) T. Laskaris, Epistolae CCXVII (Florence, 1898), pp. 271-276;

Angold pp. 179-180; Bréhier p. 401; Fuchs p. 55.

(23) Autobiography cc. 24D-25C.

(24) Cf. John Vatatzes' mention of the study of philosophy as path to the highest offices and honors in Akropolites I, p. 49, ll. 12-21. Cf. also how the support of education by the Emperor was expected in the ensuing century in Barker pp. 166-168.

(25) For important references to the 'university' during various reigns see:-

For the reign of Theodosios Theodosian Code Book 14, Title 9, 3(1), pp. XXV, 653, tr. and commentary by C. Farr and others, (Princeton, 1952).

For Theophilos: Theophanes Continuatus, Chronographia, MPG 109 c. 206; George the Monk, Chronicon, MPG 109 c. 868.

For Michael III: Theophanes Continuatus, Chronographia, MPG 109 cc. 200, 208.

For Constantine VII: Theophanes Continuatus, Chronographia, MPG 109, c. 461 and the reflections of P. Lemerle, Le premier humanisme byzantin (Paris, 1971), pp. 264-265.

For Basil II: Little primary evidence for higher education, but cf. the remarks of R. Browning 'Enlightenment and Repression in Byzantium in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries' Past and Present 69 (November, 1975), p. 7. Other studies of the university until 1204 include J. Kyriakes 'The University: Origins and Early Phases in Constantinople' B 41 (1971), pp. 161-182 and the detailed P. Speck Die Kaiserliche Universität von Konstantinopel (Munich, 1974) which concentrates on the ninth and tenth centuries.

(26) Cf. Browning, op. cit. n. 25, p. 7 and Lemerle, op. cit. n. 25, passim.

- (27) Autobiography c. 25C; Gregory of Cyprus, Laudatio Michaelis Palaeologi, MPG 142, c. 381A.
- (28) Akropolites I, pp. 46-47, 49-50, 62-64; Angold p. 176.
- (29) Akropolites I, p. 125, ll. 17-18, p. 131, ll. 8-9.
- (30) Autobiography cc. 25C-28A; Gregory of Cyprus, Laudatio Michaelis, MPG 142, c. 381A. In c. 380D, Gregory mentions that such a dramatic change occurred in learning under Akropolites that previous times had been 'prevalent with ignorance'.
- (31) K. Vogel 'Byzantine Science', CMH 4, ii, pp. 267-8 and 268, n. 1.
- (32) L. Bréhier, 'Notes sur l'histoire de l'enseignement supérieur à Constantinople', B 3(1926), p. 79; V. Laurent, 'Le Quadrivium et la formation intellectuelle sous les Paléologues'; P. Tannery Quadrivium de Georges Pachymere (Vatican, 1940), p. XVII.
- (33) Autobiography c. 25CD.
- (34) Cf. the attitude of Michael Anchialos in R. Browning, op. cit. n. 25, p. 16.
- (35) Cf. the mention of Plato, Gregory of Cyprus Laudatio Michaelis, MPG 142, c. 381A.
- (36) Autobiography c 28AB.
- (37) Autobiography c. 28C.
- (38) Autobiography c. 28B.
- (39) Whether the students of Akropolites paid fees is not really known. Gregory almost implies a free admissions policy in the autobiography, c. 25C. Since Akropolites had been appointed by the Emperor, his stipend probably came from the imperial treasury.
- (40) Council in Trullo, canon 64, MPG 137, cc. 736BC; Bréhier pp. 411-412; D.M. Nicol 'The Byzantine Church and Hellenic Learning', Byzantium: Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World, article 12, p. 24. Canon 64 declares that laymen

must go to secular schools and that they must not be permitted to teach theology.

- (41) For references to its early history, cf. Bréhier pp. 492-493; F. Dvornik, 'Photios et la réorganisation de l'académie patriarchale', Mélanges P. Pieters 2 = AB 68(1950), pp. 108-25. For the eleventh and twelfth centuries, cf., R. Browning, op. cit. n. 25, pp. 15-16 and idem., 'The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century', B 32(1962), pp. 167-202 and 33(1963), pp. 11-40. H.G. Beck has argued 'Bildung und Theologie im frühmittelalterlichen Byzance', Polychronion Festschrift F. Dolger zum 75 Geburtstag (Heidelberg, 1966), p. 69ff. that up to and including the tenth century, evidence of a patriarchal school is inconclusive.
- (42) Note that the layman Theodore of Smyrna, a pupil of John Italos, succeeded him and continued to teach philosophy for at least twenty years. Later, however, the position was filled by Michael of Anchialos, a future Patriarch, R. Browning, op. cit. n. 25, p. 16. Note also the jurisdiction of the patriarchal school over formerly secular institutions, idem. p. 15.
- (43) Pachymeres I, pp. 282-284; J. Darrouzès, Recherches sur les 'Oeuvres de l'Eglise Byzantine (Paris, 1970), pp. 110-111; M. Treu, 'Manuel Holobolos', EZ 5(1896), p. 543. For the debate, cf. the different conclusions of Fuchs, pp. 57-58; K. Vogel, 'Byzantine Science', CMH 4, ii, p. 275; S. Runciman, The Great Church in Captivity, (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 114-115; and M. Treu, op. cit., p. 543.
- (44) Pachymeres I, p. 283.
- (45) For the title, cf. M. Holobolos, Orationes, ed. M. Treu (Potsdam, 1906-7), p. 30.
- (46) Bréhier p. 412; R. Browning, op. cit. n. 41, 32(1962), p. 178.

- (47) Traditionally, the instructor of the Gospels headed the school.
Cf. Bréhier, p. 412.
- (48) M. Attaleiates, Historia, CSHB (Bonn, 1883), p. 21, mentions the title. Citing Blemmydes pp. 55-59, Angold demonstrates its use during the Empire of Nicaea, p. 179.
- (49) Theophylact, Epistolae, MPG 126, cc. 436, 509, 536; Bréhier p. 414; idem., 'L'enseignement classique et l'enseignement religieux à Byzance', Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuse 21(1941), p. 52.
- (50) For his theological work, see below, chapters four and five.
- (51) Pachymeres I, p. 374. Gregory wrote three letters to Holobolos, Eustratiades Letters 92, 3, p. 28; 96, 3, p. 29; and 122, 3, p. 289.
- (52) P. Lemerle, 'Élèves et professeurs à Constantinople au Xe siècle', Académie des Inscr. et Belle-Lettres, lecture (28 November, 1969), p. 11, estimates at about 300 the total number of persons receiving higher education at tenth-century Constantinople. Quoted in C. Mango, 'Byzantine Literature as a Distorting Mirror', Inaugural lecture delivered before the University of Oxford, (Oxford, 1975), p. 5. Also mentioned in P. Lemerle, op. cit., n. 29, pp. 255-257. According to D.J. Geanakoplos, Interaction of the 'Sibling' Byzantine and Western Cultures (New Haven, 1976), p. 159, a libellus against the Union of Lyons, mentions that Holobolos had 336 students. This number seems an exaggeration and the digits could be of biblical significance. For the text of the libellus, cf. A. Vasiliev, Anecdota graeco-byzantina, (Moscow, 1893), pp. 179-188.
- (53) Cf. the remarks of J. Meyendorff, 'Spiritual Trends in Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Century Byzantium', Art et Société, p. 56 (=Kariye Djami 4, p. 96).

III. Unionist and Anti-Unionist (1273-1282)

Gregory's Constantinopolitan education probably ended in early 1273. His mastery and erudition at the conclusion of his course qualified him for an instructorship and he was quickly promoted. (1) How this promotion occurred is not very clear, but previous practice might offer some clues. The eleventh century Life of St. Athanasios of Athos mentions how the saint became 'master after the master' (μετὰ τὸν παιδευτὴν Παιδευτῆς) at his school. (2) If this practice continued in late thirteenth century Byzantium, Gregory may have assumed such a position. Assistantships (οἱ ἐν τῇ συνεδρείᾳ τοῦ διδάσκαλου) were usually conferred upon the best students and Gregory might have received such an award for his successful rhetorical labors. (3) Following his assistantship, he could have been elected by teacher(s) and students to a professorial chair.

In his autobiography, Gregory mentions his devotion to rhetoric, the subject which he principally taught. Defending the art of rhetoric, he vehemently attacked those who corrupted its beauties. (4) As with Psellos and most other Byzantine writers, an adequate study of rhetoric seemed an absolute necessity to him. Like Psellos, he despised those (especially philosophers) who neglected to present their thoughts in the most beautiful language. (5) Giving examples from the ancient rhetoricians, Gregory stressed the imitation of their noble style in both oratory and composition. (6) According to the historian Gregoras, it was actually he who '... had brought to light the rhythm of Greece and rescued the Attic tongue from its long oblivion. With his natural mastery and industriousness, he revived them'. (7)

We have no definite information on either the title or the place

of Gregory's teaching position. As mentioned in the previous chapter, two schools of higher education had been established at Constantinople in the late 1260's; the location of Akropolites' remains unknown, but Holobolos' was held at the Church of St. Paul in the Orphanotropheion. Whether Gregory succeeded Akropolites at his final promotion, continued as his assistant, or moved to another institution is open to debate. Because of his deep involvement with Michael's plan for Church union and his ensuing trip to Lyons, Akropolites may have given up his tenure as instructor and passed it on to Gregory. With imperial approval, he then would have continued Akropolites' course at its original site or elsewhere.

There are three institutions at which Gregory might have taught in late thirteenth-century Constantinople. Obviously, the first is the Church of St. Paul in the Orphanotropheion. Prior to the Latin occupation and Holobolos, the Orphanotropheion had served as a school offering ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία. Alexios I not only supported it but himself came and questioned the pupils. (8) Long associated with the patriarchal school, it continued as that school at Holobolos' appointment in 1266. (9) Michael VIII re-established the σχολὴ γραμματικευομένων and Holobolos probably directed it in addition to his duties to higher ecclesiastical learning as 'rhetor of the rhetors'. (10) Both the grammar school and the patriarchal school of higher studies shared the same quarters. Perhaps the grammar school acted as a preparatory course for the higher school. It seems doubtful that Gregory taught at the Orphanotropheion, even in light of the demise of Holobolos in 1273. He was not a cleric and his course was too advanced for ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία and too 'secular' for the patriarchal school.

The second, and least likely choice, is the Monastery of the Chora.

It has been felt that there was a school at the Chora throughout the Palaiologan period. Gregory himself makes no mention of the Chora but scholars have assumed that various allusions in the letters of the monk Maximas Planoudes (1255-1305) refer to a school at the Chora. This monastery 'school' was seen by commentators as a new phenomenon in Byzantine education since it offered education to the laity. Previously monastic schools had served only the educational needs of novices with a purely theological course. St. Basil's Rule had allowed for the admission of 'pueri saeculares' but the Council of Chalcedon abolished this practice. (11) The shortage of instructors at Constantinople might have caused the reinstitution of the practice and it has even been suggested that the influence of Western monasticism was responsible. (12) Despite all this speculation, an examination of the relevant letters of Planoudes brings no evidence to light that the Chora possessed a school in the early Palaiologan period or that Planoudes actually taught there. All that can be said is that he moved from a monastic school somewhere in Constantinople to the Akataleptos Monastery about 1300. (13)

The Akataleptos foundation seems the most likely place to put Gregory during his teaching career. In his correspondence, he speaks of 'the Monastery of the Savior', called the Akataleptos, 'where we reside'. (14) He probably entered there at the time he was appointed a reader by the Patriarch Joseph some time in early 1273. (15) Since we know that Planoudes went to the Akataleptos to live and work, it must have been that the Akataleptos possessed a library, a necessary prerequisite for the establishment of a school. Set aside as a reader by the Patriarch yet a layman, Gregory of Cyprus probably received permission to teach his courses there. In contrast to the duties Planoudes would have (a mixture of ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία and higher education), Gregory's curriculum and students reflected higher learning solely. (16)

During the decade he taught at Constantinople, Gregory supervised the work of many important students. Among these were Nikephoros

Choumnos, Manuel Neokaisarites, and Theodore Mouzalon, all of whom would eventually hold positions in the imperial government. (17) Since all of them were laymen, this demonstrates that Gregory's 'school' at the Akataleptos was opened to the laity. Indeed, it may have been the first monastery school at Constantinople to do so. We know nothing of Planoudes' teaching until later in the century, but Gregory's residence at the Akataleptos and his teaching date from 1273 to about 1283, well in advance of Planoudes. (18)

With his pupils, Gregory instituted a 'pagan' course inspired almost entirely by ancient letters. In the progymnasmata (exercises) assigned to his students, he allowed Greek mythology, tales from Aesop, and scenes from Homer to be used. For their guidance, he himself composed a series of progymnasmata to be used as models. (19) In addition to these, a compilation of a list of proverbs by Gregory, placed in alphabetical order to aid student memorisation, has come down to us. (20) In the classroom Gregory renewed the quarrel between the old and new rhetoric at Byzantium, a debate prevalent since at least the time of Anna Comnene. (21) According to him, many writers and speakers had begun to ignore the example of the ancients to the detriment of the Greek language. Gregory instilled respect and enthusiasm for the ancients in his students and they continued this attitude following his death. The defense of the old rhetoric reached its climax in the debate which would occur between Gregory's pupil Choumnos and the Grand Logothete Theodore Metochites in the early fourteenth century. (22) From his pupil's remarks, Gregory's course reflected an advanced study of rhetoric, indispensable to those seeking placement in the imperial service.

At approximately the same time Gregory became an instructor at Constantinople, he was appointed a reader by the Patriarch Joseph I. (23)

This appointment opened the way for him into the ranks of the imperial clergy and he immediately filled the office of πρωταποστολάριος at the palace. (24) The duties of the protapostolarios included the reading of the prophecies from the Old Testament and the lessons from the Epistle at imperial ceremonies. (25) Gregory's promotion gave him direct access to the imperial household and he soon became involved in imperial policy itself. To mark his entrance into the ceremonial life of the palace, he may have composed his 'Enkomion to the Emperor Michael Palaiologos, the New Constantine'. Celebrating the heroic qualities of Michael VIII, he praises the Emperor's exploits, especially his banishing of the Latins from the 'ancestral city' of Constantinople and his victories over the Empire's other enemies. (26) The enkomion may have ingratiated Gregory to the Emperor and secured a place of importance for him that entailed duties other than those associated with court ceremonial.

By late 1273, Michael VIII had already spent a year in attempting to convince his subjects that union with Rome was imperative. He had made little progress, however, as he faced the strong opposition of the Patriarch Joseph and John Bekkos, the chartophylax of St. Sophia. Every day the Emperor held a meeting with the Patriarch and other prelates to discuss the possibility of union but these attempts always ended in stalemate. (27) A small but select group of men had come to the Emperor's support during this period and among these was Gregory of Cyprus himself. Whether he became a unionist of his own volition or through the influence of Akropolites and Holobolos is not certain but his name appears in the sources as an important force in the unionist group at this date. Almost immediately after his promotion to protapostolarios, he seems to have become involved in the imperial policy of union with Rome. The Rhetor Holobolos and the imperial

archdeacons Constantine Meliteniotes and George Metochites were among the most prominent adherents of the unionist cause. (28) According to Pachymeres, both Meliteniotes and Gregory stood particularly close to the Emperor at this time. (29)

One of the chief tasks of the unionist literati was to provide the Emperor with information on past relations with Rome. Historical commentaries and documents concerning the compromise of the Emperor John III Vatatzes and the Patriarch Manuel earlier in the century were brought out and examined. Although none of the Emperor's party had actually prayed or celebrated with the Latins, they hoped to demonstrate by their research that this could be done. When the Emperor required information to persuade the imprisoned Bekkos of the common beliefs held by both Churches, he no doubt depended upon this group for the text. Even so, problems developed between the Emperor and his unionist associates. Upset because he had not been invited to sit at one of the many meetings the Emperor was convening, Holobolos withdrew his support of the unionist cause even as Bekkos provided his. Also displaying loyalty to John IV Laskaris, he was punished and exiled to Nicaea by Michael. (30)

With the disgrace of Holobolos and Bekkos' change of mind, the small unionist party set about in earnest to promote union with Rome. Recent manuscript research shows Gregory's part in the preparation of some of the documents drawn up by the unionists. (31) The first of these, 'drawn up by the Cypriot', was an imperial chrysobull of late December, 1273. (32) By early 1274, it led to the acquisition of a few bishops' signatures in favour of the union but little else; the remainder of Byzantine society refused to give its assent. Consequently, when the Byzantine delegation departed for Lyons under Akropolites, it represented only the sentiments of Gregory and his

associates even though it claimed to speak for all Byzantium.

Following the enactment of the Union, the Emperor attempted to enforce it at Constantinople. Well aware that the great majority of the population opposed the Union, he resorted to the most forceful action. The Patriarch Joseph was removed and replaced by Bekkos, anti-unionists were tortured, and Byzantium was soon transformed into a battleground of controversy. Michael felt so insecure that he had another document composed 'by the Cypriot' which all palace officials were obliged to sign to demonstrate their loyalty to the Emperor. (33) Both the Arsenites and the Josephites remained adamant in their anti-unionist position and the turmoil increased. Despite the opposition, Bekkos managed to convene two 'councils' in the aftermath of Lyons; in 1275, the Union itself was ratified and in 1277 it was reconfirmed. (34) But these conciliar actions were worth little more than the paper on which they were written. Byzantium had no desire for union and internal peace would not be restored until the agreements of Lyons were revoked.

That Gregory became a unionist remains somewhat surprising. His youth on Cyprus had given him the unpleasant first-hand experience of Frankish domination and exploitation, both hardly conducive to pro-Western sentiments. In Constantinople itself, people said that it was the Latin customs on Cyprus that had transformed him into a unionist, even though his memories of that island were largely unpleasant ones. (35) He was clearly happy to emigrate to lands free of Latin domination and his change of mind seems to have come only with higher studies at Constantinople and the probably influence of Akropolites and Holobolos.

In addition to the difficulties created by the Union of Lyons,

Gregory had another problem in the late 1270's. In his autobiography he mentions the ecclesiastical unrest and the detriment it caused his work but he adds another difficulty: 'various physical maladies plagued him (Gregory), especially those of the head, but from the beginning, the most difficult was dropsy since he abhorred the use of wine from birth'. (36) From his correspondence, we know that this disease was a recurring problem and Gregory sometimes gives its symptoms. (37) His chronic illness often brought to his side his friend and personal physician Theognostos, a teacher at Constantinople. (38) Grateful to God at his recoveries, Gregory asked prayers of his friends during his illnesses. (39) These periods, according to him, brought not only weakness of body but what is worse, weakness of spirit. (40) Plagued by sickness while teaching at Constantinople, his poor health continued during his patriarchate. (41)

In the eight remaining years of Michael's reign following the Union of Lyons, the turmoil created by it never really abated. How Gregory fared, as a member of the unionist party, is not clear but his situation did change. One of the letters written prior to his patriarchate implies that he moved from the Akataleptos Monastery. (42) As the opposition to unionism grew, he may no longer have been welcome to reside there although it seems he spent most of his time teaching and writing rather than advancing the unionist cause. Since he held the office of protapostolarios, he may have moved into the palace itself; brief notes to the ἐπί τῶν δεήσεων from this period might confirm his greater involvement at the palace. (43) Also, at

Missing pages are unavailable

approximately the same time, he speaks of the office of reader as a preparation for the diaconate. (44) His thoughts were turning to ordination.

Gregory of Cyprus' relations with the unionist party continued late into the reign of Michael VIII. In a letter, he could still address Constantine Meliteniotes as 'trustworthy archdeacon', showing that friendly relations continued between them. (45) Even more revealing are Gregory's remarks in his 'Enkomion to Andronikos Palaiologos', written after the Union of Lyons was revoked. There, he justified Andronikos' acceptance of the Union (and his own, for that matter) by stressing the importance of obedience to the former Emperor. (46) Whenever he did change his mind, it becomes obvious that he was not transformed into a rabid anti-unionist. Witnessing the horrible consequences of Lyons, he may have questioned the Union's value and recanted in the early 1280's or he may have waited until Michael's death in late 1282. When Gregory ended his open support of the unionist cause, he associated himself with neither the Josephites nor the Arsenites. Remaining 'neutral', he probably became well-acquainted with Akakios of Phrygia and his supporters, a group which believed in peaceful co-existence with the Arsenites and Josephites. (47)

At the death of Michael VIII Palaiologos, Gregory of Cyprus stood at the threshold of a completely new situation. Throughout the upheaval of Byzantine society that occurred following the Union of Lyons, he had remained largely in the background as he continued to teach and write. The dissolution of the Union created a situation which caused the complete reversal of his role in Byzantine society. No longer a unionist, he was about to be thrust into the foreground to deal with some of the problems his unionist policy had created. His teaching

duties were to be sacrificed and his 'secular' writings replaced by an output of purely theological compositions that the period demanded. With his promotion to the patriarchate by Andronikos II, his private life ends and his controversial public life begins.

Notes - Chapter Three

- (1) Gregory's correspondence contains a number of letters to his pupils. Using the chronology adopted by W. Lameere, La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Gregoire de Chypre, (Brussels, 1937), pp. 197-203, its inception can be dated to the mid-1270's. Since many of the early letters are addressed to Gregory's students, his instructorship must have begun quite soon after his schooling.
- (2) I. Pomjalovskij, Žitie prepodobnago Afanasija Afonskago (Saint Petersburg, 1895), mention in P. Lemerle, Le premier humanisme byzantin (Paris, 1971), p. 258.
- (3) Autobiography c. 28B; Bréhier p. 469; Fuchs p. 21.
- (4) Autobiography c. 29BC.
- (5) Compare Autobiography c. 29C with M. Psellos 'Enkomion to Metropolitan John' (Sathas 5, p. 148), quoted in Barker p. 132. See also G. Böhlig, Untersuchungen zum rhetorischen Sprachgebrauch der Byzantiner (Berlin, 1956), passim.
- (6) N. Choumnos, 'Pamphlet II', Anecdota Graeca 3, ed. J. F. Boissonade (Paris, 1831), pp. 369-70; J. Verpeaux, Nicephore Choumnos, homme d'état et humaniste byzantin (Paris, 1959), pp. 30-31.
- (7) Gregoras I, p. 163.
- (8) A. Komnene, Alexiad, ed. A. Reifferscheid (Leipzig, 1884) II, pp. 290 ff.; Janin p. 399.
- (9) Cf. the remarks of R. Browning, 'The Patriarchal School of Constantinople in the Twelfth Century, B 32(1962), pp. 174-175.
- (10) Pachymeres I, p. 284.
- (11) Bréhier p. 417; idem., 'L'enseignement classique et l'enseignement religieux à Byzance', Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuse 21(1941), pp. 63-64.
- (12) Nicol 'The Byzantine Church and Hellenic Learning' Byzantium:

Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World

(London, 1972), article 12, p. 30.

- (13) Maximi monachi Planudis Epistulae, ed. M. Treu (Breslau, 1890), Letters 8, 27, 67, 70; C. Wendel 'Planudes' Pauly-Wissowa Real Encyclopädie 20, ii(1950), cc. 2206-2208; idem, 'Planudea' BZ 40(1940), pp. 406-410. On the Chora cf. Janin pp. 531-540 and P. Underwood, Kariye Djami.
- (14) Eustratiades, Letter 20, 1, pp. 422-423; Janin p. 504. For the latest archaeological investigation of the Akataleptos, cf. C.L. Striker and Y.D. Koban, 'Work at Kalenderhane Camii in Istanbul, Preliminary Reports', DOP 21, 22, 25, 28 (1967, 1968, 1971, 1975).
- (15) Pachymeres II, p. 42.
- (16) Compare the remarks on Gregory and Planoudes by K. Vogel, 'Byzantine Science', CMH 4, ii, pp. 275-276.
- (17) Many of Gregory's letters were written to his students. Cf. especially Eustratiades, Letters 42, 1, p. 437 and 57, 2, pp. 202-203. In the imperial service, these three filled the respective positions of epipanikleiou, protasekretis, and Grand Logothete.
- (18) For Planoudes' activities during this period, cf. C. Wendel, 'Planudea', BZ 40, p. 421.
- (19) Progymnasmata, ed. S. Eustratiades,
(Alexandria, 1910), pp. 215-230.
- (20) MPG 142, cc. 445-469.
- (21) N. Choumnos, Pamphlet II, op. cit. n. 6; A. Komnene, Alexiad, ed. Reifferscheid, II, pp. 293-94 (Leipzig, 1884).
- (22) For the debate, cf. below, chapter seven.
- (23) Pachymeres II, p. 42 and note p. 720.
- (24) Pachymeres I, p. 374 mentions Gregory as protapostolarios but does not give the occasion of his appointment.

- (25) Pseudo-Kodinos, De Officiis, ed. J. Verpeaux (Paris, 1966), p. 194, ll. 2-3; J. Darrouzès Recherches sur les 'Oppixia de l'église byzantine (Paris, 1970), p. 532.
- (26) MPG 142, cc. 346-86. For references to the Enkomion, cf. Geanakoplos p. 17 and J. Verpeaux, op. cit. n.6., pp. 35-36.
- (27) Pachymeres I, p. 394.
- (28) Gregoras I, p. 130; G. Metochites I, p. 36; Pachymeres I, p. 374. Pachymeres uses the title protapostolarios in reference to Gregory's unionist activities, thereby suggesting that he had already received the position.
- (29) Pachymeres I, p. 374.
- (30) Pachymeres I, 393-394. Holobolos had much ill fortune with Michael. Cf. his earlier punishment by mutilation for Iaskarid sympathies, Pachymeres I, pp. 487, 493.
- (31) J. Gill, 'The Church Union of Lyons (1274) Portrayed in Greek Documents' OCP 40(1974), pp. 5-45, esp. p. 11.
- (32) Chrysobull, op. cit. n. 31, pp. 13-19.
- (33) Document, op. cit. n. 31, pp. 32-35. Gill dates this document mid-1277 but see his remarks p. 11.
- (34) Synodal decrees, op. cit. n. 31, pp. 22-23, pp. 22-29, Beck pp. 58-59.
- (35) Gregoras I, p. 165; D.M. Nicol 'The Byzantine Reaction to Lyons' Byzantium: Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World (London, 1972), article 6, p. 127.
- (36) Autobiography, c. 29A ll. 13-17.
- (37) Eustratiades, Letters 72-74, 3, pp. 9-13; 88, 3, pp. 24-25; 103, 3, pp. 34-35; 136, 3, pp. 122-123; 171, 5, pp. 217-223.
- (38) Eustratiades, Letters 12-13, 1, pp. 418-419; 15, 1, pp. 420-421; 79, 3, p. 17; 83, 3, p. 20; 107, 3, pp. 39-40; 114, 3, pp. 45-47;

167, 5, pp. 213-214. Letter 83 mentions his teaching at Constantinople.

- (39) Eustratiades, Letters 72, 3, p. 9 and 74, 3, pp. 12-13.
- (40) Eustratiades, Letters 72, 3, p. 9 and 73, 3 pp. 11-12.
- (41) Eustratiades Letters 136, 3, p. 22 (*Régestes* 1476) and 171, 5, p. 217 (*Régestes* 1503): *Lameere* Letter 217; *Vaticanus graecus* 1085, fol. 262r, letter 212 and *Lameere* Letter 225, *Vat. gr.* 1085, fols 260v, 261r, letter 207.
- (42) Eustratiades Letter 85, 3, p. 22.
- (43) Eustratiades, Letters 93-95, 3, pp. 28-29. For the office cf. *Pseudo-Kodinos, Traité des Offices*, ed. J. Verpeaux (Paris, 1966) p. 173, ll. 1-15, p. 183 ll. 24-7.
- (44) Eustratiades Letter 88, 3, p. 26.
- (45) Eustratiades Letter 90, 3, p. 26.
- (46) *Iaudatio Andronici*, *MPG* cc. 408C-409A. J. Verpeaux, *op. cit.* n. 6, pp. 34-35, dates the *enkomion* 1284-5 because it contains praise for Andronikos' support of Orthodoxy and the condemnation of Bekkos.
- (47) For the personality of Akakios, cf. *Pachymeres* II, p. 45. *Troitskij* pp. 231-232 even suggests that Akakios headed a 'neutral' party.

Missing pages are unavailable

IV. Patriarch of Constantinople (1283-1289)

Following his father's death, Andronikos II inherited both the throne and the problems created by Michael VIII. Foremost among these problems was the ecclesiastical strife which resulted from not only the Union of Lyons but also from Michael's removal of three patriarchs. Andronikos did not possess the political skill and intuition of his father, but he realised that he had to solve the ecclesiastical problems of the Empire before he could hope to address himself to other issues. As he considered himself something of a theologian, the new Emperor enjoyed appearing knowledgeable concerning theological matters. (1) Despite his theological interests, Andronikos was perplexed by the various factions which divided Church and society at Byzantium. Any attempt to appease one group immediately alienated another. As a result, it proved difficult for him to construct a firm policy in response to these factions. In complete contrast, the Church became the dominating force within the Empire despite its fragmentation into various factions. (2)

After his accession in 1282, it became more and more evident that Andronikos was thoroughly confused as to how he should deal with the ecclesiastical situation. Because of his indecisive nature, he depended on the suggestions of those around him. He received especially persistent advice from two people who had been punished by Andronikos' father for their opposition to his unionist policy, his aunt Eulogia and the Grand Logothete Theodore Mouzalon. Andronikos' first official act, the complete renunciation of the Union of Lyons, was followed by a succession of events inspired by these two advisors. Mouzalon, a zealous Josephite, naturally favoured his party and he had every intention to destroy the unionists and Bekkos, their leader. By late 1282, Andronikos was spending his nights with the former Patriarch Joseph

in secret conversations that Mouzalon himself may have arranged. (3)

At Christmas, John Bekkos was removed from the Patriarchate to a nearby monastery by imperial order. (4) He went willingly and expressed hope that his removal would aid the cause of peace in the Church. A few days later, on 30 December, Joseph was reinstated to the patriarchal throne. Old and infirm, he was borne into the city on a stretcher, as crowds followed, singing hymns to the ringing of bells. Now that Joseph occupied the throne once again, the demands of the Josephites were enforced. Saint Sophia was purified with holy water to remove 'unionist contamination' and special proposals for the punishment of unionists were made. Many who now inflicted punishments were survivors of Michael's persecution who had only recently been released. Their over-zealous conduct made it difficult for the Patriarch to control them, and the Emperor did little to interfere with their 'judgments'. All of the clergy involved in the Union of Lyons were suspended for three months and Pachymeres, the historian of the period, says 'many unjust things occurred' because the anti-unionists were permitted such a free hand in their punishments. (5)

But these cathartic proceedings did not fully assuage the passions of the anti-unionists. Discontent remained high, especially since Bekkos, the leader of the unionist party had escaped punishment. Although two of his closest supporters, the archdeacon George Metochites and the chartophylax Constantine Meliteniotes had already been unfrocked, Bekkos continued to reside undisturbed in the Monastery of the Panachrantos. (6) In January 1283, a concentrated effort for the trial of Bekkos began, and by the end of the month, preparations had been made for a council designed to try him for usurpation of the patriarchal throne as well as for his unionist policies. (7) Apparently,

the Josephites had added the charge of usurpation to the general grievances of the anti-unionists.

With the convocation of the Council of 1283, the first mention of Gregory of Cyprus since the reign of Michael VIII occurs in the Byzantine historians. (8) According to Pachymeres, Gregory was present at the Council together with the Grand Logothete, the Rhetor Holobolos, just released from detention, and the monk Theodosios Saponopoulos. These are the only names the historian mentions in connection with the council and it might be assumed that they all attended in some official capacity. Gregory evidently retained the position of protapostolarios after the accession of Andronikos II, but there is no mention of the part he played in the Council of 1283. (9) Since he had been ordained a reader by Joseph, he possessed a measure of devotion to the old Patriarch although not a Josephite himself. (10) His unionist past and his current association with the 'neutral party' of Akakios of Phrygia precluded such a possibility.

Patriarch Athanasios of Alexandria presided at the council since the condition of the Patriarch was so delicate that he could not attend. (11) Although Joseph's throne remained vacant, his supporters appointed themselves as the spokesmen for his views. The attendance of the Patriarch of Alexandria provided a sense of legitimacy but Theodore Mouzalon actually presided. At his suggestion, all the documents concerning the Union of the Churches were burnt, and he himself threw his own compositions into the flames. Bekkos was then accused of heresy because he had compiled various quotations (among them, those of Niketas of Maroneia, twelfth century bishop of Thessaloniki and Nikephoros Blemmydes, who both 'agreed with the Italians') and had 'tried to interpret them in a way contrary to their original

meaning'. (12) Because of the fury of the council's members, Bekkos refused to appear until he was granted safe conduct by the Grand Logothete. When he did appear, he asked to be tried by the bishops who had elected him Patriarch. In response, his accusers replied that there was no place for him even if acquitted, since the rightful prelate now held his former position. Without further reference to his theology, Bekkos was forced to resign and exiled to Brusa. (13)

The Council of 1283 clearly demonstrates the strength of the Josephites. Bekkos' actual removal from office resulted from the charge that he had usurped the patriarchal throne from Joseph. His unionist theology occupied a subordinate place in the proceedings and he received no opportunity to defend it. Bekkos' confession to Joseph was libelled by the Josephites and it was at their instigation that the Emperor exiled him. At the conclusion of the council, the Josephites, led by Eulogia and Mouzalon, persuaded the Emperor not only to confirm all the decisions of the council in writing, but to promise that his deceased father would never receive burial by the Church nor be commemorated in a requiem. (14) For the Josephites, it was the moment of their greatest triumph.

While the Josephites celebrated their victory, the Arsenites stirred in the provinces. The persecutions of Michael VIII had caused many of them to leave Constantinople, but the concessions of Andronikos II to the Josephites angered them sufficiently to return to the capital with their grievances. They began insisting that Arsenios had excommunicated Joseph from exile and they persuaded many to avoid the current Patriarch. (15) This claim frightened the Emperor in particular, since it called into question the validity of his own coronation which Joseph had performed in 1272. According to the Arsenites, not only was Andronikos the son of an excommunicated

Emperor but he had been crowned by an excommunicated Patriarch as well!

The Emperor had little choice but to yield to the demands of the Arsenites. When it became apparent that he would, many Josephites began to join their ranks. Andronikos, former Bishop of Sardis and one of the first Arsenites, returned to the capital and resumed leadership of the party. (16) Following his conversations with the Emperor, the Arsenites received the abandoned Church of All Saints in Constantinople for their own services. Through such gestures as this, the Emperor hoped to convince them that he had their best interests in mind. (17)

Each of the religious-political parties saw the other as being in schism and this attitude created tremendous tension in the capital. During March 1283, the condition of the Patriarch Joseph continued to deteriorate, as did the strength of his party. With his death on 23 March, the Josephites were left leaderless. (18) Although he still feared the Josephites after the Patriarch's death, the Emperor stepped up his appeasements to the Arsenites. (19) Now that the patriarchal throne was vacant, both parties expected one of their own to be elevated to the patriarchate. Due to the recent imperial concessions to their group, the Arsenites felt especially certain that their leader, Andronikos of Sardis, would be chosen. The Emperor had other plans, however.

Frustrated by the factionalism in the Church, Andronikos searched for a via media between the two parties. Rather than infuriate one party by choosing a member of the other, he settled upon a compromise candidate for the patriarchate. Shortly after the death of Joseph, the Emperor selected the protapostolarios Gregory of Cyprus as his choice for Patriarch. (20) Andronikos wanted the type of person against whom nothing could be said. Even though Gregory had been a unionist in the past, he now associated with the 'neutral party' of

the pious yet open-minded Akakios of Phrygia and his pupil Germanos. Because this party separated dogmatic questions from canonical ones, it attempted to co-exist in peace with both the Josephites and the Arsenites. Gregory had been ordained protapostolarios by Joseph but also showed respect for the memory of Arsenios. (21) His renowned scholarship as well as the adulation of his students fully demonstrated his abilities.

Andronikos announced his decision to each bishop privately, and presented it in a way that each would be receptive to it. By this, he secured the assurance that Gregory would be elected even before the bishops had assembled to consider his candidacy. (22) Andronikos of Sardis and the Arsenites were infuriated by the Emperor's choice. Eventually, the Arsenite leader was called to the palace for consultation with the Emperor. Although the Emperor announced to Andronikos that he would not succeed Joseph, he hoped to appease the prelate and his party by new concessions. He thereupon made Andronikos the imperial confessor and promised that he would be restored to his see following Gregory's election and installation. To the Emperor's relief, Andronikos agreed and even the Patriarch-designate came to him for his blessing 'not because there was a need, but out of flattery'. (23)

Once the election of Gregory had been secured, there remained the problem of his consecration. Since he held only the office of reader and was still a layman, his installation as Patriarch could not occur until he himself possessed the threefold ministry of deacon, priest, and bishop. This entailed his ordination and consecration by other bishops and the probable loss of his value as a compromise candidate. If a Josephite, Arsenite, or former unionist ordained Gregory, there was a possibility of repudiation by the other factions. Logically, only those not involved in the controversies of the past

twenty years were permitted to participate in Gregory's elevation.

At this time, two bishops from the more remote regions of the Empire were visiting Constantinople. Neither the Bishop of Kozyle nor the Bishop of Devrai had had any part in the previous ecclesiastical scandals, thus making them especially suitable for the task. Of these two, the Emperor chose the Bishop of Kozyle to ordain Gregory because of his precedence. (24)

Every precaution was taken in the elevation of Gregory. After his designation as locum tenens of the see of Constantinople, the Bishop of Kozyle took Gregory and a few others to the Monastery of the Forerunner in Petra. There, in the middle of the vineyards, they found an abandoned church where the bishop tonsured Gregory a monk and ordained him a deacon from the office of reader. Later that day, Gregory took up residence at the Patriarchate and began the task of patriarchal administration even though he had not yet been elevated to the patriarchal throne. Following this, the locum tenens chose the monk Germanos of the neutral party as Bishop of Herakleia. According to custom, only this bishop could preside at the consecration of the Patriarch of Constantinople. (25) Germanos was then elevated to the episcopacy in St. Eirene after the altar had been washed thoroughly to remove any taint of the Union of Lyons that might remain. During the same liturgy, Gregory was ordained a priest by the new bishop. (26) On 11 April 1283 (Palm Sunday), Gregory was consecrated a bishop and elevated to the patriarchate in St. Sophia. Once again, special prayers were offered as the altar was washed; the patriarchate of Gregory II was clearly intended to mark a new beginning.

Gregory's own assessment of his elevation to the patriarchal throne reflected mixed emotions at best. Because of the constant ecclesiastical turmoil, he marked his accession as the termination of

a much happier life. As a scholar and teacher, Gregory viewed his former 'academic' life as his true vocation. He reiterated again and again that his own ambitions had played no part in his acquisition of the patriarchate. (27) Only because he had been called by the Emperor to serve as Patriarch at a time of crisis did he do so. He fully realised that 'problems which no other Patriarch had ever contended with' awaited him. (28)

On the day following Easter (19 April 1283), an imperial edict was issued which reinstated the elderly Andronikos of Sardis to his see. In his opinion, this act revealed the righteousness of God and had occurred so that he might take revenge upon the impious. In this instance, 'impious' did not connote unionists, but rather those who had harmed John Laskaris, caused injustice to Arsenios, and deposed Andronikos from his see. He was fully prepared to take revenge on even the old and infirm responsible for the first removal of Arsenios almost a quarter century earlier. Since both the Emperor and the Patriarch were at Andronikos' mercy for fear that he would incite the Arsenites to greater controversy, they agreed to convene a council designed to punish his adversaries. (29)

The Council was held in the Church of Blachernai from 19-26 April. It was a complete triumph for Andronikos of Sardis and the Arsenites. Although the Patriarch attended, his participation did little more than ratify the whims of the Bishop of Sardis. As the council convened, bands of rowdy monks anathematised the defendants before they received the opportunity to defend themselves. In such an atmosphere, it proved impossible for anyone to avoid punishment. Those who refused to appear were fetched by imperial officers. Theodora, the wife of Michael VIII, was forced to profess her Orthodoxy and promise that her husband would never receive Christian

burial. The Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria were asked to renounce their unorthodox deeds. Theodosios Prinkips, the Patriarch of Antioch resigned and took refuge in Syria while Athanasios of Alexandria remained adamant in the face of his accusers. His name was removed from the diptychs, but this did not frighten him and he continued to live in Constantinople afterwards. Gregory disapproved of much of this but he had no choice but to accept the word of the council. Secretly, he did not hesitate to call it an evil event. (30)

Gregory's actual feelings, although expressed in secret, must have eventually come to the attention of the Arsenites following the Council of Blachernai. Many of them felt that he leaned towards the Josephites, and this accusation became more credible once the Patriarch's attitudes to the recent council became known. Perhaps Gregory did not comply sufficiently with the demands of the Arsenites, or so it seemed to them. As their numbers grew and they continued their campaign against the Josephites, the Arsenites increasingly identified the Patriarch with that party until they were openly calling him the leader of the Josephites. Because Gregory had spent his youth on Cyprus, some were saying that he had been influenced by Latin customs, and there was even a rumor that he had been ordained reader by the Latins. (31) It was evident the Arsenites still wanted the Bishop of Sardis on the patriarchal throne.

In late 1283, the Emperor decided to convene yet another council in the hope that the Arsenites might be reconciled to the Church. He ordered the Patriarch and his opponents to come to Adramyttion on the coast of Asia Minor, where he was spending the winter. (32) The continued agitation in the capital may have necessitated the need for the council to be held outside it, but the choice of Adramyttion could

also be interpreted as a concession to the Arsenites who retained their strength in the former areas of the Empire of Nicaea. A great variety of people travelled to the council aboard the Emperor's ships, having their expenses paid by imperial stipend. Among these were Eulogia, her daughters the protovestiarissa Theodora Raoulaina and Anne, and the Grand Logothete Theodore Mouzalon. Although Andronikos of Sardis did not attend, a number of other prominent Arsenites did, especially those monks who had been persecuted by Michael VIII. These included Hyakinthos, who led the party in Andronikos' absence, Lazaros Gorianites, Makarios Peristeres, and Athanasios Lependrenos. (33)

Throughout Lent, the Emperor spoke every day with the Patriarch and his colleagues nearby, but he could say nothing that would convince the Arsenites to reconcile themselves to the Church. The Arsenites expected some divine sign to show them what to do but this attitude only irritated the patriarchal party. Finally, the Arsenites and the Emperor compromised and decided to draw up two documents. In the first, the Arsenites put down their demands while the second document contained the patriarchal party's refutation. Both documents were to be submitted to fire and the one surviving adhered to. If both survived or were destroyed, the parties decided this expressed the divine wish for unification. On Holy Saturday (8 April 1284), in the presence of the Emperor, the two documents were placed in the flames. Both were reduced to ashes and both parties gave themselves over to the Emperor's wishes. Later that day, all the participants went to greet the Patriarch and to accept his authority through his blessing and the reception of Holy Communion. (34) It appeared that the Arsenite schism had ended.

By Easter morning, most of the Arsenites had reconsidered and rejected their decision to be reconciled to the Church. They felt

fell from favour with the extremists and was accused by some of them of conspiring against the Emperor. Such a commotion ensued that he was finally brought to trial and once again relegated to the status of a monk. (37)

Those Arsenites who had made peace at Adramyttion were eager to bring the body of Arsenios from Proikonisos, where it had remained since the Patriarch's death in exile. In mid-1284, the Emperor granted their request and the body of the prelate was brought to Constantinople by ship. Amid great solemnity, both the Emperor and the Patriarch accompanied the body to St. Sophia, where a liturgy was celebrated by those Arsenites in communion with the Patriarch. (38) Later, the protovestiarissa Theodora Raoulaina, one of the Arsenites who had recognised Gregory as Patriarch, translated Arsenios' body to her own foundation of St. Andrew in Krisei. Despite the return of Arsenios' body, the extremists still refused to be reconciled to the Church. They continued to oppose the Patriarch and even began to demand that Hyakinthos be placed on the patriarchal throne. Amidst Arsenite demands that the Patriarch resign, Gregory performed the wedding ceremony of Andronikos II to Eirene of Montferrat, the Emperor's second wife. (39) He evidently had no intention of complying.

While the Arsenite problem consumed the energies of the Patriarch and the Emperor, the exiled John Bekkos made plans for his own return to Constantinople in the hope that he might clear himself of the charge of heresy. Although the Emperor had provided for his every comfort in Brusa, Bekkos remained greatly dissatisfied. (40) The participants in the Council of 1283 had not allowed him the opportunity to defend his theology and he felt his deposition fully unjustified. In the autumn of 1283, Bekkos had composed an encyclical which was disseminated in Asia Minor. (41) Throughout 1284, the document caused

quite a sensation and incited many to demand the convocation of a new council with the explicit purpose of trying Bekkos. (42)

At Brusa, Bekkos had been suffering much derision from the local inhabitants as a result of his former unionist policies. He could not understand how they accepted Gregory as Patriarch, someone who had been born among the Latins, while they derided him, a true 'Roman' (i.e. Byzantine). (43) Bekkos emphasised this point in his arguments with the Brusans, and it eventually reached Constantinople. This new attack upon the Patriarch's character may have caused Gregory finally to decide in favour of a council. During 1284 he had envisioned nothing but complications from a possible appearance of Bekkos in Constantinople and did nothing, but by the end of that year, the Patriarch had decided upon the need for a council. (44) To prepare for it, in January 1285, the Patriarch suspended all clerics ordained by Bekkos. (45) He then demanded the convocation of a council and it was decreed by imperial command that Bekkos should receive a new trial in Constantinople. (46) Already under confinement at Brusa, he was summoned to the Constantinopolitan Monastery of Kosmidion while the preparations were made for the council. (47)

The Second Council of Blachernai was convened in early February 1285 in the Alexiakon triklinion of the palace of Blachernai. (48) The Emperor presided over a large gathering of bishops, clergy, monks, and laity. Both Gregory of Constantinople and Athanasios of Alexandria were present, the latter so ill that he remained on a stretcher during the sessions. Theodore Mouzalon stood near Gregory in order to support him with his theological knowledge. Bekkos and his two staunchest supporters Constantine Meliteniotes and George Metochites formed the opposition in a debate centering upon a maxim that Bekkos put forth favouring the Latin teaching concerning the Procession of

the Holy Spirit. (49) Since the time of Photios in the ninth century, the Eastern Church had accepted the words concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit in the Nicene Creed at their face value: The Holy Spirit 'proceeds from the Father' alone. Prior to Photios, there had been Byzantine theologians who had allowed for the Son's participation in the Procession with some qualifications. (50) Among these was the great eighth-century Father, John of Damascus. A text from one of his writings furnished the keystone for Bekkos' pneumatological defense at the council and provided the justification for both his unionist theology and policy.

In the debate, Meliteniotes and Metochites cited the quotation from John of Damascus as it appeared in the 'Priestly Armory' ('Ιερὰ 'Οπλοθήκη) a compendium of various theological compositions used by the Byzantine Church. (51) The quotation itself referred to God the Father as the 'projector of the revealing Spirit through the Word' (προβολεὺς διὰ λόγου ἐκφαντορικουῦ πνεύματος). Both of Bekkos' champions hoped to show with this quotation that the Father was indeed the source (αἴτιος) of the Holy Spirit through the Son, thus making the Son a cause of the Spirit's eternal procession. Naturally, this use of a Byzantine Father to support a Latin doctrine enraged Bekkos' opponents. To say the least, the quotation was open to a number of interpretations due to its ambiguity. Theodore Mouzalon and the chartophylax George Moschabar attacked the interpretation of Metochites and Meliteniotes vehemently. (52) Gregory of Cyprus followed up with the accusation that the meaning of the quotation had been distorted by the unionists. According to the Patriarch, the sayings of the Fathers were interrelated in such a way that they remained in full agreement with one another since they originated from the same Spirit. To emphasise this, he called upon Bekkos and his colleagues to prove that

other Fathers of the Church agreed with their interpretation. (53)

In response, Bekkos attempted to base his proof upon a quotation from St. Gregory of Nyssa concerning the interrelationship of the three persons of the Trinity but he elicited only contempt from his opponents, especially from the Patriarch of Alexandria. (54) Expressing his disagreement, Athanasios maintained that the things Bekkos uttered had never been taught by the Church, and urged him to recant so that peace might be restored. Bekkos refused and both sides continued to try to outdo one another with dialectical subtlety. Bekkos even insisted that the prepositions *ἐκ* (from) and *διὰ* (through) were interchangeable in most patristic passages. Finally, in desperation, he took the charge of heresy against himself and turned it against his opponents. Reading from a manuscript which he had kept concealed beneath his cloak, the accused asked the Patriarch what he thought of the ideas expressed in the theological tract. Gregory and all present confirmed that it contained heretical ideas. Brilliantly, Bekkos showed the treatise to be by none other than George Moschabar, the chartophylax and one of his opponents. If he should be tried for heresy, should not this person be tried as well? he announced. (55)

The entire assembly was thrown into confusion by this turn of events, but Bekkos used it as the basis for his final defense. Considering his sources sound, the defendant pleaded with his judges not to repudiate patristic dogma. According to Bekkos, the fact that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father had been substantiated by the words of Christ (John 15:26) and the Second Ecumenical Council in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. Likewise, he felt that anyone who said that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father through the Son merely followed the Seventh Ecumenical Council. (56)

But this council would have none of it, and the Patriarch of Constantinople asked Bekkos to renounce his views for the last time. In response, the former Patriarch refused, and foretold that the agitation in the Church would never subside until Gregory himself had left the patriarchate. The Emperor, who had already sacrificed so much for the Church, was especially enraged by Bekkos' attitude and responded with a very stern speech. No amount of rhetoric would change Bekkos' mind, however, and the council could only respond with its condemnation of him and his companions. Convicted of heresy, the three defendants were sentenced to imprisonment on the Gulf of Astakos. (57)

Following the condemnation of Bekkos, the council continued its deliberations. (58) There was still concern as to how the quotation of John of Damascus could be interpreted so as to be dissimilar to Bekkos' explanation. A closer examination of the entire text revealed another quotation which read 'We do not say that the Spirit proceeds from the Son'. Using both quotations together enabled the council to refute the similitude of $\epsilon\chi$ and $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ which Bekkos had advocated. But there still remained the problem of the first quotation; an Orthodox interpretation of 'through the Son' was required. To remedy the confusion, it was decided to commission a tomos which would proclaim the truth of the matter. Because the wisdom of Gregory of Cyprus commanded such respect at Constantinople, the Patriarch was asked to write a tomos that 'would be a pillar of piety for succeeding generations'. (59) He assented and immediately set about the task.

Throughout the summer of 1285, the Patriarch addressed himself to the problem. Feeling that the quotation from John of Damascus implied more than the participation of the Son in the temporal mission

of the Spirit, Gregory searched for an expression that showed the participation of the Son in an eternal sense. Finally, he chose the term 'eternal manifestation' (ἀΐδιος ἔκφανσις). (60) According to Gregory, "If some of the saints have said 'the Spirit proceeds through the Son' this points to the eternal manifestation of the Spirit by the Son, not the unique personal procession of the Spirit as he emerges into being from the Father". (61) The Patriarch completed the document by August and submitted it so that it might be solemnly proclaimed in St. Sophia. After the tomos had been read, both the Emperor and the Patriarch signed it, followed by the other bishops and clergy. Some of those present at the ceremony were suspicious of the document and refused to sign. They remembered the consequences of their signatures to the Union of Lyons, and feared similar reprisals if the tomos were revoked in the future. Especially troublesome to many of them was the explanation Gregory gave to the passage of John of Damascus. Since they could not understand it, they refused to sign their names to it. Because they could not distinguish the difference between the actual coming into being of the Spirit and its eternal manifestation, they insisted that it had to be one or the other. Eventually, some accepted Gregory's guarantee of the expression's validity but others still refused despite his constant entreaties. Those who did so were relieved of their offices and stipends. (62)

Despite the care Gregory had taken with the tomos, the incident with the signatories proved to be only the first of a number of complications that followed its proclamation. By some means, Bekkos acquired a copy of the tomos and composed his own refutation of it. (63) Although he criticised many things in it, his principal argument concerned the implications of the word προβολεὺς. If various meanings could be attached to this word (author, source, originator), then

procession(πρόοδος) and eternal manifestation(ἐκφανσις αἰδίου) meant one and the same according to him. He marked Gregory's explanation ambiguous and turned his refutation over to some of his friends who circulated the document among the Constantinopolitan public. It created great unrest in the city and reopened the entire question concerning the Orthodoxy of the tomos, especially among those who had not signed from conviction but had accepted the Patriarch's guarantee. (64)

Among these were Moschabar, who had recently resigned over a disagreement with the Patriarch, and his colleagues Pentekklesiotes and the new chartophylax Eskammatismenos. These men had every intention to cause misfortune for the Patriarch, especially since Moschabar held a grudge against him. To do this, they decided to attack Gregory's explanation of the word προβολεὺς itself. They felt that it must mean αἴτιος (author, originator) in regard to the act of the procession of the Holy Spirit, just as the word γεννήτωρ (Father) was used for the birth of the Son of God. In their view, Gregory did not use προβολεὺς for the designation of the act of procession (πρόοδος) but as a synonym for the act of manifestation (ἐκφανσις). Although he distinguished between these two acts, he denied that προβολεὺς meant αἴτιος. (65)

Despite the controversy caused by the tomos, Gregory did not ignore his other patriarchal duties. Already unpopular, he risked greater unpopularity when he excommunicated Germanos of Herakleia (1286-9?). (66) Although he had consecrated Gregory as Patriarch of Constantinople, Germanos later decided to excommunicate him because of his unionist attitudes during the Union of Lyons. Probably upset by the tomos, he not only accused Gregory of taking part in prayers with the Latins but also of communicating with them. (67) The see

of Herakleia had already caused problems by its refusal to recognise the canonisation of the Patriarch Joseph. (68) Since it was an Arsenite stronghold, Germanos probably had been pressured into refusing the commemoration of Joseph. Gregory intended to remain firm in insisting upon Joseph's commemoration and this, together with Germanos' excommunication of him, led the Patriarch to depose him. The Patriarch received criticism for his action, especially from Methodios the monk but did not recant. (69) Almost simultaneously (1286-87), he also deposed Patriarch Arsenios of Antioch for having accepted the King of Armenia into communion. The King was not an Armenian but rather a Latin ruler who still administered some of the areas retained from the Crusades. (70)

During Gregory's patriarchate, many monasteries suffered unrest due to the Arsenites and related canonical problems. The Protos of Mount Athos visited the Patriarch, requesting that he visit the Holy Mountain to help restore order. Arsenite agitation may have divided the community but it seems Gregory never received the opportunity to visit. Arsenites had also infiltrated some of the monasteries in Thessaloniki, causing additional problems for the Patriarch. (72) At Mount Galesion, the monks were refusing to recognise their bishop, the Metropolitan of Ephesos. (73) At Constantinople, the Patriarch may have found some pleasure in the continuing work of the patriarchal school. Although he does not mention it in his letters, its continuing existence is confirmed by the synodal lists of 1277 and later documents. (74) Gregory's interest in Cyprus and its Church continued during his patriarchate. He wrote a letter to Henry II of Lusignan and received reports concerning the status of the Orthodox Church there. (75) He still had many relatives on the island but does not seem to have kept in touch with them. (76) Outside the realm of

ecclesiastical politics, Gregory attempted to mediate in the dispute between the Emperor Andronikos and the sebastocrator of Thessaly John Doukas. (77) The Patriarch's charitable interests also continued. (78)

In the meantime (probably 1286-7), another controversy concerning the tomos arose. A monk by the name of Mark, a converted Jew, had decided to write a commentary on the Patriarch's treatise. (79) Since he had been taught by the Patriarch and had served as his secretary, Mark felt that he understood Gregory's theology. Once he had completed his commentary, the monk submitted it to the Patriarch for approval. Gregory read the paper over, corrected it, and returned it to the author. Proud of his achievement, Mark took the commentary and displayed it to the public. Those who carefully read it discovered that Mark had explained *προβολεὺς* as a synonym for *ἐκφανεὺς* just as the Patriarch had been accused of doing in the tomos. When Theoleptos, the Bishop of Philadelphia, read the commentary, he immediately went to his friend, the Grand Logothete Theodore Mouzalon. (80) Although the bishop knew that the commentary contained errors, he still asked Mouzalon what he thought of it. As the Grand Logothete pronounced the commentary heretical, Theoleptos presented him with Gregory's tomos for inspection. Taking into consideration the synonym, Mouzalon had to agree that there was no difference between the two documents. Nonetheless, he gave the Patriarch the benefit of the doubt by stating that Gregory was probably not fully aware of what he had done. (81) Having recently read the Patriarch's 'Apology', a work written against the tomos' calumniators (and Bekkos in particular), the Grand Logothete may have had a clearer understanding of Gregory's pneumatology. (82)

Few others were as forgiving as the Grand Logothete. Those who had signed the tomos and could not criticise it because of their signatures, now used Mark's commentary as a means to attack the Patriarch. If the Patriarch were not a heretic, he would have corrected the mistake they announced. Gregory could not tolerate these attacks, principally because his accusers said that he had failed concerning the most important theological problem of the work. Such an attitude only infuriated the Patriarch's enemies who demanded that he accept his mistake. Finally, Gregory's opponents appeared before the Emperor and announced that they were unable to persuade the Patriarch, thereby proving that the mistake was not merely an oversight, but his actual opinion. Placing great pressure upon the Emperor, they reiterated how many had made sacrifices for the Church in the past. Even Andronikos himself had, and they demanded that the Patriarch do likewise. From this moment, the Emperor began to distrust the Patriarch as Gregory's opponents gained the upper hand. (83)

The attitude of the Patriarch enraged and hardened the Arsenites against him. Since they believed the only opinion the Church could hold was that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father (and that nothing more could be said), their agitation increased. Completely ignorant of the writings of the Fathers, they wanted the words 'through the Son' struck out, no matter in what context. To them, the idea of an eternal manifestation of the Spirit through the Son could only be interpreted as a heterodox innovation. Consequently, they once again demanded the Patriarch's removal. If Gregory resigned, then and only then would they live in peace. Athanasios of Alexandria, who had been among those who refused to sign Gregory's tomos, had become the new spokesman for the Arsenites. He carried their renewed demands for the Patriarch's removal to the Emperor, even as Gregory's other

opponents filed their complaints. Eventually, the Emperor sent Athanasios to the Patriarch; whether he carried an imperial request for Gregory's resignation is not known. (84) Shortly afterwards (mid-1288), Gregory announced his temporary withdrawal to the Monastery of the Hodegetria in a sermon. Because the Arsenites had promised to be peaceful if he left the patriarchate, he had decided to leave temporarily to test them. Retiring to the monastery, he continued to fulfill his duties as Patriarch. (85)

Throughout the controversy, the party of Moschabar had gained in strength. By 1288, Theoleptos of Philadelphia, angered by Gregory's refusal to rectify his error, had joined it and other bishops followed his example. Among these were two favorites of the Patriarch who owed their elevations to him, John Cheilas of Ephesos and Daniel Glykes of Kyzikos. According to Gregoras, 'they turned against him just as Brutus and Cassius had done with Caesar'. (86) During the crisis, Gregory had written at least four times to Cheilas, requesting him to come to his aid in Constantinople. (87) Only two of these letters have been edited while the other two are still in manuscript. These two unedited letters reveal the Patriarch's increasing dilemma and his frantic state. In the first, he seems to think that Cheilas can help convince the other bishops of their misunderstanding of the situation. (88) The second, addressed to both Cheilas and Glykes, speaks of the tragic situation in Constantinople. But even as the Patriarch wrote, John and Daniel were deciding to join the party of Moschabar. At the time Gregory retired to the Hodegetria Monastery, John of Ephesos arrived in Constantinople to stir up further antagonism against the Patriarch. He sent a letter to the Emperor in which he briefly presented his party's disagreements with the Patriarch. (90) Andronikos now began to doubt whether the Eucharist was valid when the

Patriarch's name was commemorated. Theoleptos of Philadelphia, John of Ephesos, and Daniel of Kyzikos were already refusing to commemorate the Patriarch in the Liturgy, and this practice gradually spread. The demands for the election of a new Patriarch increased. (91)

From his place of retreat at the Hodegetria, Gregory learned of the defection of Cheilas and Glykes. Their desertion came as probably the most agonising event during the Patriarch's time of troubles. Only friendly correspondence had passed between him and these two bishops previously but now Gregory's attitude towards them changed to one of painful anger. (92) In the final letter which he wrote to Cheilas, still unedited, his pain is obvious: 'Know that the madness of your tongue and the unjust barbarousness of your own judgment is causing me suffering..... How much it nourishes the situation and how much by the situation it is nourished'. (93) The isolation of the Patriarch was now complete.

Despite pressure, Gregory's attitude had remained unchanged. He had been chosen to write the tomos because of his theological knowledge, and he refused to bow to criticisms that resulted merely from semantic squabbling. Although his friends' defection had been a great blow to him, it also enraged him enough to send a letter to the Emperor at the end of 1282. (94) The only actual change that had occurred with the Patriarch at this time was the place of his residence. Cyril of Tyre had arrived in Constantinople for his confirmation as Patriarch of Antioch, but was refused because of dealings with the King of Armenia. (95) Consequently, he decided to remain in Constantinople and chose the Hodegetria as his place of residence. Realising the implications of any contact he might have with Cyril, Gregory immediately left the monastery and went to a house attached to the Monastery of St. Paul on Mount Iatros. He spent the final months of his reign there, writing his letter of complaint to the Emperor and drawing up a con-

fession of faith which rejected the commentary of Mark. (96)

In early 1289, Gregory decided to resign if he received a guarantee of his Orthodoxy. (97) This baffled his opponents since they felt he would have no reason to resign if they proclaimed him Orthodox. Instead, his enemies demanded that a trial be held to decide the matter. Both the Emperor and the Patriarch agreed, and the preparations were made. After some reflection, however, the Emperor decided to cancel it. He realised that, no matter what its outcome, the scandal would remain. Andronikos' decision came at the eleventh hour, for Gregory and his party had already arrived at the palace for the first session when it was announced. Even Gregory's opponents showed relief when they heard the news. Still demanding the Patriarch's removal, they now promised to proclaim him Orthodox in exchange for his resignation. The quaestor Nikephoros Choumnos, the former student of the Patriarch, and the deacon George Pachymeres carried a message containing these terms to the Patriarch, but he was hesitant to accept them. Gregory realised that his opponents wished to pronounce him Orthodox secretly and still announce him as a heretic in public. In response, he demanded that his Orthodoxy be proclaimed publicly. (98)

The Patriarch's demand created a split in the opposition. John of Ephesos and Daniel of Kyzikos with their followers refused to allow a public proclamation of Gregory's Orthodoxy. They condemned both his tomos and Mark's commentary and announced their complete disapproval of the expression 'eternal manifestation'. In contrast, the party of Theoleptos of Philadelphia decided to accept Gregory's Orthodoxy by means of *oikonomia*. (99) Considering Mark's commentary and its heretical implications the actual cause of the scandal, they intended to proclaim the Patriarch's Orthodoxy. If he did not adhere to his promise to resign in exchange for the pronouncement, they could depose him for committing perjury. (100)

Andronikos attempted to persuade John of Ephesos and his followers to agree to the terms of Theoleptos, but they remained adamant. Accusing them of causing further division in the Church, he imprisoned all of them in various monasteries until the election of a new Patriarch. The Emperor decided that at that time they would be judged, especially John of Ephesos, since he had written the worst against Gregory. In June 1289, a council was convened with Theoleptos as the spokesman. (101) Because of the view of his party of Mark's commentary and the dissemination of Gregory's confession of faith, the council summoned Mark to defend his position. (102) When he did appear, he retracted his statements in the commentary, saying that his sole purpose had been to agree with the tomos. (103) But now, after reflection, the monk not only rejected his position in the commentary, but also the Patriarch's explanation of 'eternal manifestation'. (104) Since the monk's understanding of the Patriarch's pneumatology seemed confused and he admitted his error, the council felt this sufficient to clear the Patriarch. Declaring the Patriarch Orthodox and blaming the entire scandal on Mark's commentary, they then sent a written guarantee to the Patriarch. (105)

The next day, Gregory wrote the following resignation:-

'I was elevated to the patriarchal throne through no ambition of my own nor through the encouragement of my friends but ascended it by means known only to God. Since I became Patriarch six years ago, I have done my best for the peace of the Church and the elimination of scandal. But this attempt failed and some people began exclaiming that only my resignation would bring peace. Not being able to endure these things, I prefer this peace rather than the first place. For this reason, I resign from

the patriarchal throne and office but not from the priesthood which, with the help of God, I will keep during my lifetime. I do this only for the unification of the Church and not because I have offended the sacred office.

So, you are now able with the grace of God to elect another Patriarch who will unify and give peace to the Church with the alliance and assistance of God. And may our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ grant us this through His Holy Mother and all the Saints'. (106)

Some people suspected Gregory's sincerity because he submitted the resignation without his signature affixed to it. (107) Once again there was controversy, but Theoleptos convinced those who demanded the Patriarch's signature to be satisfied with the letter written in the Patriarch's own hand. To everyone's relief, the controversy had finally ended. Following the resignation, Gregory forgave even his harshest opponents, among them Germanos of Herakleia and Neophytos of Brusa. To those whose incomes had been interrupted during the scandal, he was especially generous with gifts. (108) In the summer of 1289, he retired to the Monastery of Aristine near the Monastery of St. Andrew in Krisei, the foundation of his supporter Theodora Raoulaina. (109) Since the rapprochement of some of the Arsenites following Adramyttion, she had given Gregory much support. When Raoulaina refounded St. Andrew in Krisei, a monastery closed since the Fourth Crusade, she had become a nun with the name of Kyriake. She possessed a large library of manuscripts which she moved into the Monastery of Aristine, the small monastic house attached to her foundation. (110)

Raoulaina's library and her personal invitation brought Gregory to the Aristine for his retirement. (111) During this time, he

busied himself with a number of tasks. He placed his vast correspondence in order, wrote his brief autobiography, and continued with his theological work. (112) During this time, he probably wrote the treatise 'Concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit'. (113) But the battles of the past six years had claimed much of his strength, and he was now a man broken in both body and spirit. Within a year of his retirement, he died following a brief illness, possibly the result of the dropsy he had suffered for so long. The Emperor forbade Raoulaina to attend the obsequies, allowing no public funeral for fear that it might cause a disturbance. (114)

Following Gregory's resignation, the problem of the tomos remained unresolved. Andronikos was especially worried that it might become the cause of fresh controversy at almost any moment. Hoping to make the 'necessary' corrections to the text, he called yet another council. Much argument ensued but little agreement. In desperation, the assembly decided to leave the original text intact but to expunge the troublesome passage of John of Damascus rather than to risk its misinterpretation. Even so, Gregory had been vindicated and the doctrine of the 'eternal manifestation' remained unchallenged. (115)

Notes - Chapter Four

- (1) For Andronikos' concern for the Church, cf. Pachymeres II, pp. 14-16; A. Laiou Constantinople and the Latins (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), p. 32ff.; Troitskij p. 196.
- (2) Nicol pp. 105-106; Ostrogorsky p. 487.
- (3) Pachymeres II, pp. 14-17.
- (4) A chronology for this period has been suggested by V. Laurent, 'Les dates du second patriarcat de Joseph Ier', REB 18(1960), pp. 207-208.
- (5) Gregoras I, pp. 160-162; Pachymeres II, pp. 17-25.
- (6) Cf. Janin, p. 214.
- (7) Pachymeres II, p. 25.
- (8) *ibid.*
- (9) *ibid.*
- (10) *ibid.* and note p. 720.
- (11) For biographical notices on Athanasios of Alexandria (called 'the Sinaite'), cf. C. Loparev, 'ὁ Ἀθανάσιος ὁ Β', πατριάρχης Ἀλεξανδρείας' EF 1(1908), pp. 456-472 and in Russian, VV 15(1908), pp. 287-299; C. Papadopoulos 'Ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας Ἀθανάσιος Β', EEBS 6(1929), pp. 3-13; *idem.*, 'Ἱστορία τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἀλεξανδρείας' (Alexandria, 1935), pp. 564-574.
- (12) Pachymeres II, 25-27.
- (13) *ibid.*
- (14) *ibid.*
- (15) Pachymeres II, p. 37; V. Laurent 'L'excommunication du patriarche Joseph Ier par son prédécesseur Arsène', EZ 30(1929-30), pp. 489-496.
- (16) Pachymeres II, p. 38. Andronikos had protested the first removal of Arsenios in 1259. As a result, he was eventually deposed and confined to a monastery. Cf. Pachymeres I, pp. 118-119; Troitskij pp. 37-40

- (17) Pachymeres II, p. 40.
- (18) The Patriarch Joseph was canonised after his death. For a mention of this, see a letter of the monk Methodios to Gregory of Cyprus in Cod. Vat. gr. 1137, fol. 14r. cf. Régestes 1461 and now the newly edited text in V. Laurent and J. Darrouzès Dossier grec de l'union de Lyon (1273-1277), (Paris, 1976), pp. 518-22.
- (19) Pachymeres II, pp. 38-39.
- (20) Gregoras I, pp. 163-164, Pachymeres II, p. 42.
- (21) Pachymeres II, pp. 42, 45. Cf. also Troitskij's evaluation, pp. 231-232.
- (22) G. Metochites I, p. 95, ll. 6-7 complains of Gregory's seizure of the throne without regard to the canons.
- (23) Pachymeres II. pp. 43-44, 50 and n. 16 above. G. Metochites I, p. 96, ll. 6-8 attributes Gregory's 'usurpation' to the Arsenites.
- (24) Gregoras I, p. 164. The Bishop of Kozyle was dependent upon Naupaktos (Lepanto) and thus on Constantinople. In contrast, the Bishop of Devrai was a suffragan of the see of Ohrid.
- (25) Gregoras I, p. 164; Pachymeres II, pp. 44-45. The tradition that permitted the Bishop of Herakleia to preside at the consecration of the Patriarch of Constantinople had been observed since the time of Constantine the Great. Herakleia predated the see of Constantinople and enjoyed an honorary seniority. Cf. Beck p. 161.
- (26) There is a slight disagreement between Gregoras and Pachymeres in regard to Gregory's ordination. Gregoras says that the Bishop of Herakleia ordained him a deacon (Gregoras I, p. 165). Both agree that Gregory was ordained a priest by the Bishop of Herakleia.

- (27) Autobiography c. 28C. Cf. also his letter of resignation, Pachymeres II, pp. 130-131 and above pp. 113-114. G. Misch 'Die Schriftsteller-Autobiographie und Bildungsgeschichte eines Patriarchen von Konstantinopel aus dem XIII Jahrhundert', Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts 21(1931), p. 8, senses an allusion to Plato's 'Republic' in this section of the autobiography. He compares Gregory's call from the study to the Patriarchate to the philosophers appointed to rule in the Republic. 'The philosophers..... must be forced to understand that the joy of pure contemplation in which they fulfilled their individual lives must be cut short'.
- (28) Autobiography cc. 28D-29A.
- (29) Pachymeres II, pp. 50-52; F. Dölger Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des östromischen Reiches (Munich and Berlin, 1931-65), n. 2091.
- (30) G. Metochites I, pp. 98-100, 105; Pachymeres II, pp. 52-57; Régestes n. 1463. The Empress Theodora's profession of faith has been edited three times - J. Dräseke, Zeitschrift für wiss. Theologie 35(1891), pp. 353-354; K. Simonides, 'Ορθόδοξων Ἑλλήνων Θεολογικαὶ Γραφαί' (London, 1865), pp. 85-88; S. Petrides EO 14(1911), pp. 25-28, 133-136. On Theodosios V. Prinkips (Cheilas) see D.I. Polemis, The Doukai (London, 1968), p. 171. He was replaced as Patriarch of Antioch by Arsenios Hagiosymeonites and then by Cyril of Tyre (Pachymeres II, p. 56). Cf. Régestes n. 1498.
- (31) Gregoras I, p. 165.
- (32) Eustratiades Letter 143, 3, pp. 97-98; Régestes n. 1469.
- (33) Pachymeres II, pp. 57-59. For the persecutions of Lazaros Goaritanites' and Makarios Peristeres, cf. Pachymeres I, p. 489. Makarios had lived 'in the West' and was accused of treason for plotting with the 'western archons'. Hyakinthos was also 'a monk from

the West' (perhaps Epiros or Thessaly) who started a school for boys at Nicaea until the Patriarch Arsenios put a stop to it. For this and his connections with the Tarchaniotes family (especially John Tarchaniotes, to whom Andronikos of Sardis was related), cf. Pachymeres I, p. 294, II, p. 38. Cf. also Régestes n. 1503. Gregory of Cyprus corresponded with Athanasios Lependrenos, a monk from Mount Auxentios, Eustratiades, Letters 147 and 148, 4 pp. 103-105; Régestes nos. 1478 and 1491. His party was excommunicated at Adramyttion but it seems he recognised the Patriarch later; in the letters, Gregory asks for the monk's aid. Lependrenos also receives a mention in G. Palamas, Défense des saintes hésychastes, ed. J. Meyendorff (Louvain, 1959), cf. pp. XLI-XLII.

- (34) Gregoras I, pp. 166-167; G. Metochites I, pp. 116-118; Pachymeres II, pp. 57-59; Régestes nos. 1470-1471. Cf. also Constantine Meliteniotes, Régestes p. 20.
- (35) After Adramyttion, there was an exhortation to the people, including the Arsenites, to rally to the Patriarch, Metochites I, p. 120, Régestes n. 1473.
- (36) Pachymeres II, pp. 63-64, Régestes n. 1472.
- (37) Pachymeres II, pp. 65-66.
- (38) Gregoras I, p. 167; Pachymeres II, pp. 83-86. For more on Raoulaina see p. 114 and chapter six below.
- (39) Gregoras I, pp. 167-168; Pachymeres II, p. 87.
- (40) Pachymeres II, p. 36.
- (41) G. Metochites I, pp. 121-122; Eustratiades Letter 132, 4, pp. 11-15 which also describes Arsenite unrest; Régestes n. 1474; V. Laurent 'La date du seconde synode des Blacharnes sous Grégoire de Chypre', REB 27(1969), pp. 217-218. Bekkos' encyclical is lost

unless it is, as V. Laurent suggests, in *Régestes* n. 1474, 'De depositione sua', *MFG* 141, cc. 949-969; but this seems unlikely. For the reasons, cf. J. Gill 'Notes on the De Michaelē et Andronico Palaeologis of George Pachymeres', *BZ* 68(1975), pp. 299-300.

- (42) For the unrest in the capital, cf. Eustratiades, Letters op. cit. n. 41, 134, 4, pp. 18-21; and 136, 4, pp. 22-23.
- (43) Pachymeres II, pp. 88-89.
- (44) Compare the tone of Eustratiades Letter 146, 4, pp. 102-103; *Régestes* n. 1475 with the latter letter 130, 3, p. 296; *Régestes* n. 1484.
- (45) Gregoras I, pp. 171-173; Metochites I, pp. 118-121; Pachymeres I, pp. 64-65, *Régestes* no. 1485. The document itself is in Mut. gr. 82, fols. 192rv and 193r.
- (46) Eustratiades Letter 173, 5, pp. 224-226; *Régestes* n. 1486.
- (47) Metochites I, pp. 123, 129; *Régestes* nos. 1487-88.
- (48) G. Metochites I, p. 132; V. Laurent op. cit. n. 41, p. 218. According to G. Metochites I, p. 165, the council lasted six months with four separate sessions.
- (49) Pachymeres II, pp. 89-90. Brief synopsis of the council, Gregoras I, pp. 169-171; G. Metochites' account of the council, I, pp. 132-168, concentrates upon the defense of Bekkos and his colleagues. For literature on Bekkos, cf. above chapter one, n. 23. For G. Metochites, cf. articles by V. Laurent, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. M. Buchberger (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1960), 4, cc. 703-704; R.J. Loenertz, 'Théodore le Métochite et son père', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 23(1953), pp. 184-194; J. Patinot, *QHE* 8(Athens, 1966), cc. 1097-98; and S. Salaville 'Georges le Métochite', *DTC* 6(Paris, 1920), cc. 1238-39. For

C. Meliteniotes cf. V. Laurent, Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1930ff), 7, c. 69; S. Vailhe, DTC 3 (Paris, 1938), cc. 1226-1227.

Athanasios' presence at the council must have meant that his name had been returned to the diptychs. For the removal, see above p. 97.

- (50) These theologians never expounded the Latin view that the Holy Spirit proceeded from both the Father and the Son. Those who allowed for the participation of the Son usually used the phrase 'through the Son' to express the temporal mission of the Spirit in contrast to the eternal procession of the Spirit from the Father alone.
- (51) John of Damascus, De fide orthodoxa, MPG 94, c. 808B. Andronikos Kamateros' 'Priestly Armory' had been compiled at the direction of Manuel I Komnenos. As such, it belonged to the group of twelfth-century theological compendia which included Euthymios Zigabenos Panoplia Dogmatica, MPG 130, cc. 19-1362 and Niketas Choniates Thesaurus fidei orthodoxae, MPG 139 and 140 (and in the edition of all Choniates' works, ed. J.A.J. van Dieten). Cf. CMH 4, ii, p. 219 for more details on these compendia. J. Gill 'Notes on the De Michaelis et Andronico Palaiologis of George Pachymeres', BZ 68(1975), pp. 299-300, feels that Pachymeres has misplaced some of the material from his account of the council because of unclear memory. This includes Bekkos' use of the quotation from John of Damascus which Pachymeres places much earlier than the council (Pachymeres II, p. 31). According to Gill, the surprise of the council at Bekkos' use of the quotation demonstrates that it is recent to his 'system'.

- (52) G. Metochites I, pp. 158-159; Pachymeres II, p. 91. Moschabar, appointed chartophylax by Gregory in 1283, even doubted the authenticity of the quotation of John of Damascus and eventually published a tract against it. Cf. V. Laurent 'Un polémiste grec de la fin de XIIIe siècle, la vie et les oeuvres de Georges Moschabar', EO 28(1929), pp. 138, 157.
- (53) Pachymeres II, pp. 90-91. In addition to the speeches attributed to Gregory by Pachymeres, there is another mentioned by G. Metochites I, p. 135.
- (54) Gregory of Nyssa, Ep. ad Ablabium, MFG 45, c. 133B. 'The one is immediately from the first and the other is from the first through the immediate one'.
- (55) Pachymeres II, pp. 95-99. Moschabar quickly drew up a profession of faith and presented it to Gregory following the incident. Cf. V. Laurent, op. cit. n. 52, p. 134.
- (56) Bekkos' allusion concerned a letter circulated by St. Tarasios to the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem which was read at that council. Tarasios, Ep. ad Summos Sacerdotes, MFG 98, c. 1461CD. 'The Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father through the Son and (by) God himself is revealed'.
- (57) Pachymeres II, pp. 99-103.
- (58) V. Laurent, op. cit. n. 41, p. 219 says that on 14 May 1295, the Feast of the Holy Spirit, a special synodikon was read which condemned the filioque but he does not include it in the Régestes nor do the Byzantine historians mention it.
- (59) Pachymeres II, pp. 108-111.
- (60) The expression appears in MFG 142, Tomus fidei, c. 241A; Confessio, (Omologia), c. 250; Apologia, cc. 266-267; De Processione, cc. 290, 300B. J. Meyendorff A Study of Gregory Palamas (London, 1964),

pp. 13-14 attributes it to documents dealing with the negotiations at Nymphaion in 1234.

- (61) Tomus, MPG 142 c. 241A.
- (62) Text of Tomus fidei, MPG 142, cc. 233-246; Régestes n. 1490; G. Metochites I, pp. 169-175; Pachymeres II, pp. 111-114; V. Laurent, op. cit. n. 41, p. 219. For a list of the signatories, cf. V. Laurent, 'Les signataires du second concile des Blachernes', EO 26(1927), pp. 143-149. In addition to the Emperor and the Patriarch, forty-one bishops and thirty-one clerics eventually signed. Laurent cites Ambros. gr. 653, fols. 40 and 41 as the best manuscript of the signatures.
- (63) J. Bekkos Refutatio Libri Cyprii, MPG 141, cc. 863-926; V. Laurent, op. cit. n. 62, p. 138, suggests that Bekkos had not yet been exile when Gregory's tomos appeared.
- (64) Pachymeres II, p. 115. Some people even began to accept Bekkos' refutation as valid since they now considered his censure as punishment for the disasters he had caused rather than for distortion of dogma.
- (65) Pachymeres II, pp. 115-116.
- (66) Eustratiades, Letter 168, 5, pp. 214-215; Régestes nos. 1494 and 1499.
- (67) Pachymeres II, p. 133.
- (68) Eustratiades Letter 149, 4, pp. 105-106; Régestes n. 1493. On the canonisation of Joseph, see n. 18 above.
- (69) Eustratiades Letter 152, 4, pp. 108-109 and Letter 171 5, pp. 217-223; Régestes 1535 and 1503. Sykoutres 5, pp. 120-126.
- (70) Pachymeres II, pp. 56, 121; Régestes n. 1498. Cf. also n. 30 above.
- (71) Eustratiades Letter 160, 4, pp. 120-121; Régestes n. 1501.

- (72) Eustratiades, Letter 144, 4, pp. 99-101; *Régestes* nos. 1530, 1531.
- (73) Mention, Eustratiades, Letter 160, 4, pp. 120-121, *Régestes* 1500.
- (74) Synodal list, J. Darrouzès, Recherches sur les 'Ovxiia de l'église byzantine (Paris, 1970), p. 532. Later (1281), Moschabar signed his works διδάκχαλος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Cf. Laurent, op. cit. n. 52, pp. 133-134.
- (75) Letter to Henry II of Lusignan, W. Lameere, La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre (Brussels, 1937), pp. 193-194; *Régestes* n. 1497; Eustratiades Letter 125, 3, pp. 291-292; *Régestes* n. 1522.
- (76) Eustratiades Letter 136, 4, pp. 22-23; *Régestes* n. 1476.
- (77) Eustratiades Letter 131, 4, pp. 5-11; *Régestes* nos. 1480 and 1481.
- (78) Eustratiades Letters 120, 129, 162, 184.
- (79) Pachymeres II, pp. 117-118. The actual text of the commentary has not survived but we know Mark's views from his later report to a council, ed. A. Papadakis 'Gregory II of Cyprus and an Unpublished Report to the Synod', *GRBC* 16(1975), p. 236(fol. 174r); Gregory of Cyprus, Confessio, *MFG* 142, c. 250AB; and J. Cheilas, Letter to the Emperor, *MFG* 142, cc. 245-246.
- (80) Pachymeres II, p. 118. Theoleptos was one of the most important forerunners of Gregory Palamas. On his life and work, cf. N. Choumnos 'Enkomion to Theoleptos', Anecdota Graeca 5, ed. J.F. Boissonade (Paris, 1883), pp. 201-213; G. Palamas Défense des saintes hésychastes, ed. J. Meyendorff (Louvain, 1959), pp. 98-99; J. Darrouzès Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine (Paris, 1970), p. 89; J. Gouillard 'Théolepte, métropolitain de Philadelphie', *DTC* 15, ii (Paris, 1946), cc. 339-341; V. Laurent 'Les grandes crises religieuses à Byzance. Le schisme antiarsénite de Théolepte', *REB* 18(1960), pp. 45-54; idem., 'Une princesse

byzantine au cloître', EO 29(1930), pp. 29-60; J. Meyendorff, Introduction to a Study of Gregory Palamas (London, 1964), pp. 17-20; S. Salaville 'Deux documents inédits sur les dissensions religieuses byzantines entre 1275 et 1310', REB 5(1947), pp. 116-136; idem., 'Un directeur spirituel à Byzance au début du XIVe siècle, Théolepte de Philadelphie', Mélanges Joseph de Ghellink 2 (Gembloux, 1951), pp. 877-887; idem. 'Formes ou méthodes de prière d'après un Byzantin du XIVe siècle', EO 39 (1940), pp. 1-25; idem. 'Un lettre et un discours inédit de Théolepte de Philadelphie', REB 5(1947), pp. 101-115.

(81) Pachymeres II, pp. 118-119.

(82) Gregory of Cyprus, Apologia, MPG 142, cc. 251-257. According to V. Laurent's interpretation of Eustratiades, Letter 183, 5, pp. 330-335; Régestes 1502, Gregory sent a copy of his Apology to Mouzalon for his inspection and remarks. Its contents were directed at Bekkos and his supporters with no mention of Mark so it must predate Mark's commentary. Mouzalon's remarks may be the addendum to Gregory's De Processione, MPG 142, cc. 290B-300B, written under the Patriarch's name. Cf. Eustratiades, Letter 145, 4, pp. 101-102; Régestes n. 1532. The treatise in its entirety is preserved in Vat. gr. 12, fols. 38v-46. For Mouzalon and his works, cf. DTC 10(1929), cc. 2581-2584 and Beck pp. 679-680.

(83) Gregoras I, p. 177; Pachymeres II, pp. 120-121.

(84) Pachymeres II, p. 121; Troitskij pp. 303-307.

(85) Gregoras I, p. 178; Pachymeres II, pp. 121-122, Régestes n. 1508.

(86) Gregoras I, pp. 177-178; G. Metochites III, p. 323; Pachymeres II, p. 116; J. Darrouzès Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine, pp. 88-89; Troitskij pp. 295-296. Both John and Daniel

had been monks of the Ostreidion Monastery during Gregory's early patriarchate. Cf. Eustratiades Letter 121, 3, p. 288; *Régestes* n. 1464.

- (87) Eustratiades Letter 178, 4, pp. 345-346; *Régestes* n. 1506; and Letter 179, 5, pp. 346-347; *Régestes* n. 1509; Lameere Letters 219-220, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 261v, Letters 209 and 210 respectively. Gregory had thoughts of convening a council during this period to attempt to end the ecclesiastical strife (Eustratiades Letter 191 and the remarks of Laurent, *Régestes* nos. 1505 and 1510), but the circumstances did not permit it. Perhaps one of the reasons for writing to Cheilas was to make certain that he would be in Constantinople when such a council convened.
- (88) Lameere Letter 219, Vat. gr. 1085 fol. 261v, letter 209.
- (89) Lameere Letter 220, Vat. gr. 1085 fol. 261v, letter 210.
- (90) Letter of John Cheilas, *MFG* 142, cc. 245-246; English translation in the appendix of this thesis.
- (91) Pachymeres II, pp. 116, 122.
- (92) For this correspondence, see especially Eustratiades Letters 121, 126; *Régestes* 1464 and 1465.
- (93) Lameere Letter 221, Vat. gr. 1085 fols 261v and 262r, Letter 211.
- (94) Pittakion, *MFG* 142 cc. 267-269; *Régestes* n. 1513. For a definition of a pittakion, see J. Darrouzès 'Le Registere synodal du patriarcat byzantin au XIVe siècle', *Etude paléographique et diplomatique* (Paris, 1971), pp. 172-181.
- (95) *Régestes* n. 1511. Laurent dates Cyril's arrival in early fall 1288. Cyril's predecessor Arsenios was deposed for the same reason. Cf. n. 30 above.
- (96) Pachymeres II, pp. 122-123; *Pittakion*, op. cit. n. 90; *Confessio* (Omologia), *MFG* 142, cc. 247-252; *Régestes* n. 1514. For a

description of the monastic centre on Mount Iatros, cf. H.

Ahrweiler 'L'histoire et la géographie de la région de Smyrne entre les deux occupations turques', Travaux et Mémoires 1 (Paris, 1965), p. 91, n. 123.

- (97) Document, MPG 142, cc. 125E-128C; Régestes n. 1516.
- (98) Pachymeres II, pp. 124-127.
- (99) Pachymeres II, pp. 127-128. For an explanation of oikonomia, cf. D.J. Geanakoplos Byzantine East and Latin West (Oxford, 1966) p. 74, n. 58 and J. Meyendorff Byzantine Theology (English ed., London and Oxford, 1975), pp. 88-90.
- (100) Pachymeres II, pp. 128-129.
- (101) Pachymeres II, pp. 129-130.
- (102) Although none of the Byzantine historians mention this development, Mark's report has come down to us (Cod. Athen. 1217 fols. 174r-176v). It has been edited by A. Papadakis, 'Gregory II, of Cyprus and an Unpublished Report to the Synod', GRBS 16(1975), pp. 227-239, text of report pp. 236-239, with further comments, idem. 'Gregory II of Cyprus and Mark's Report Again', The Greek Orthodox Theological Review 21(1976), pp. 147-157. Since the document refers to Gregory as Patriarch (fol. 174r, p. 236), the session occurred when he still held the throne. But see the remarks of J. Darrouzès op. cit. n. 86, p. 89, n. 5 for a different chronology of Gregory's 'Confessio' and Mark's report.
- (103) Report, op. cit., n. 98, p. 236(174r).
- (104) *ibid.*
- (105) Pachymeres II, p. 130; Eustratiades Letter 198, 5, p. 500.
Moschabar drew up the document, thus also recognising Gregory's Orthodoxy.
- (106) Pachymeres II, pp. 130-131.

- (107) Nicholas Mystikos actually set the precedent for unsigned patriarchal resignations. Cf. Arethas, scripta minora II, ed. L.G. Westerink (Leipzig, 1972), pp. 118-119 for the text.
- (108) Pachymeres II, pp. 132-133; Régestes n. 1518.
- (109) Gregoras I, pp. 178-179; Pachymeres II, p. 133.
- (110) On Raoulaina cf. chapter six below.
- (111) Gregoras I, p. 178.
- (112) J. Darrouzès, Recherches sur les 'Ovxiata de l'église byzantine (Paris, 1970), p. 455. For the use of the autobiography as an introduction to the letters, cf. Eustratiades, Letter 155, 4, p. 133 and W. Lamcere La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre (Brussels, 1937), p. 9.
- (113) De Processione, MFG 142, cc. 269-300.
- (114) Gregoras I, p. 179; Pachymeres II, p. 152.
- (115) Pachymeres II, p. 134; Laurent, Régestes n. 1490, suggests the existence of two texts of the tomos of the some thirty-five copies - the original of Gregory's text and the amended copy without the quotation of St. John of Damascus. Some copies also contain a final paragraph which affirms the thesis of procession 'ex patre solo', added to prevent the accusation of latinism. A. Papadakis, University of Maryland, is currently engaged in comparing the extant manuscripts of the tomos.

V. The Pneumatological Problem

Gregory of Cyprus sacrificed not only his patriarchate but his own personal welfare because of his tomos. Fully convinced of its Orthodoxy, he continued to defend its content, even after his resignation. His insistence upon its correctness was not a display of stubbornness or arrogance but a demonstration of the importance he attached to a solution of the pneumatological problem and the filioque controversy in particular. From the intellectual point of view, the breach that occurred between Byzantium and the West resulted from the fact that each side came to regard its own representations of the truth as absolute. (1) Gregory's solution upset many at Byzantium because it attempted a 'dialogue' with the West, threatening the absoluteness of the Byzantine position (although his opponents themselves did not fully understand the Byzantine tradition concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit). The dogmatic question of the procession 'is not a fortuitous phenomenon in the history of the Church, but rather the sole issue of importance in the chain of events which terminated in the separation (of East and West)'. (2) More than an abstract theological problem, the question of the procession of the Spirit sums up the intellectual divergence that grew between the two spheres of the medieval Christian world.

In response to the overall problem, Gregory of Cyprus drew upon the classical patristic tradition, a tradition which had been obscured at Constantinople itself. Because it was obscured, his opponents were scandalised by his apparent 'innovations'; they were unable to recognise the actual patristic basis of his pneumatological thought. The problem with which Gregory had to deal had its origins in the New Testament itself. Several Biblical passages can be cited which show a close relationship between Christ and the Holy Spirit. Of primary importance

is John: 16:13-15, in which Christ says of the Spirit 'He shall take (λήψεται) of Mine and shall show it unto you'. In addition to this, there is a rich crop of other passages to quote: Galatians 4:6 where the Holy Spirit is referred to as 'the Spirit of the Son'; Philippians 1:19 'the Spirit of Jesus Christ'; Romans 8:9 'the Spirit of Christ', and again, texts from St. John's Gospel on the sending of the Spirit by Jesus (14:6, 15:26, 16:7). (3)

As the centuries passed, the Fathers of the Church tried to clarify the role of Christ with respect to the Spirit as presented in these passages. The expression 'through the Son' (δι' υἱοῦ) is found in Origen and in Gregory Thaumaturgos (the latter writes ἐκ Θεοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἔχον καὶ διὰ υἱοῦ περηνόζ). (4) Athanasios the Great's position concerning the Son's participation in the life of the Holy Spirit is stated principally though indirectly in works against Arius. Such a quotation as 'the same things are said of the Son except His being said to be the Father' remains open to a number of interpretations. (5) More specifically, Athanasios says 'the Word gives to the Spirit and whatever the Spirit has, He has from the Word'. (6) Even so, Athanasios taught that the Father alone is solely unbegotten and the only font of divinity. He is the first teacher of the one origin (ἀρχὴ) of Godhead, an idea later expounded by the Cappadocian Fathers. His thoughts on the origin of the Godhead in the 'Monarchia' have eradicated any idea that he advocated the concept of 'double procession' (that is, the procession of the Holy Spirit from both the Father and the Son), for here he never speaks of two origins. (7)

Among the Greek Fathers, St Cyril of Alexandria must be considered one of the most important sources for the idea of a double procession. While developing his ideas in the doctrine against Nestorianism, he calls the Holy Spirit the property of the Son (τὸ ἴδιον τοῦ υἱοῦ).

For the first time in the East, not only the expression 'through the Son' but also 'from the Son' appears in his writings (ἀπόθεν δὲ καὶ ἐκ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ). (8) Cyril usually uses both terms together, the former indicating the order of origin and the latter signifying the equality of principle. (9) Theodoret of Kyrrhos personally accused Cyril of Alexandria of being in error. This type of disagreement reflected the continuing problem of the interpretation of the Biblical passages listed above. (10)

According to the Cappadocian Fathers of the fourth century, the 'structure' of the Trinity can be defined as one essence (homousios) in three persons. The Fathers make use of the two synonyms οὐσία (essence) and ὑπόστασις (person) to distinguish in God that which is common to all three Persons, the essence, from that which is particular, the Person himself (individually, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit). (11) The only characteristic of the hypostases which is not proper to each and is never found in the others is the relation of origin, i.e. the Father is not the Son or the Holy Spirit etc. If it is the relation of origin - to be unbegotten, begotten, and proceeding, then the sole source of Divinity is the Father - πηγαία θεότης as Pseudo-Dionysos says. (12)

The Father is the principal of unity among the Three. He is the source of Godhead, born of none and proceeding from none, the Son is born of the Father from all eternity and the Spirit proceeds from the Father from all eternity. But just as Christ had two births, so the Holy Spirit has an eternal procession and a temporal mission. Here, the term 'proceeds' refers not to an outward action but to the eternal relations within the Godhead. (13) A problem of semantics arises here in distinguishing the concept of 'procession' of the Spirit from the pre-eternal 'birth' of the Son. Even the Fathers were wary of

explanations. Gregory of Nazianzos says 'You ask what is the procession of the Spirit. Tell me first what is the unbegottenness of the Father and I shall then explain to you the physiology of the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit, and both of us shall be stricken with madness for prying into the existence of God'. (14)

In its Trinitarian thought, the West took as its starting point the one essence, then passed on to the consideration of the three Persons but the East went from Three Persons to one nature. (15) To contrast these two approaches, the views of St. Augustine and Gregory of Nazianzos are important. Augustine's Trinitarianism did not begin with the Father as source but with the idea of the one single Godhead which in its essence is Trinity. (16). With respect to the Holy Spirit, this meant that He proceeded as truly from the Son as from the Father: 'the Holy Spirit proceeds at once from both, although it is from the Father's benevolence to the Son that He should proceed, as from the Father himself, so from the Son also. (17) But Augustine was not the first to teach the double procession, for a little earlier St. Ambrose had begun doing the same. (18) Because of the 'essential' approach to the Trinity, the double procession theory was becoming widespread in the West.

It should not be thought that because the East took the 'hypostatic' approach, this attitude was preferred by the Fathers. They preferred that the Three and the One be accepted simultaneously - 'No sooner do I conceive of the One', says Gregory of Nazianzos, 'than I am illumined by the splendor of the Three. No sooner do I distinguish them than I am carried back to the One'. (19) What accounted for Gregory's distinctions within the Trinity was the fact that One of the Persons, namely the Father, stood in the relation of cause (*τὸ αἰτιον*) to the other Two. (20) Thus, he could say that the Spirit proceeded from

the Father through the Son, the Son being considered the Father's agent or instrument. From Gregory onwards, the term δι' υἱοῦ came to be increasingly understood as expressing the mission of the Holy Spirit in the world through the mediation of the Son. (21) By the end of the fifth century, the West was already describing the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit as 'ex patre filioque' while the East was using ἐκ πατρὸς alone. Regarding the temporal mission of the Spirit, the Western formula was once again 'ex patre filioque' while that of the East was stated ἐκ πατρὸς δι' υἱοῦ. Some earlier Eastern Fathers had used the formula ἐκ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ in this instance, but by the time of Maximos the Confessor this formula had long been forgotten.

Through the influence of St. Gregory of Nazianzos, the conception of αἰτία (cause) became especially prevalent in the East and the terms ἀναίτιος αἰτία and πρώτη αἰτία were reserved especially for the Father. Furthermore, αἰτία was narrowed to μόνη αἰτία. Responsible for this clarification were Maximos the Confessor and John of Damascus. There is a famous incident in which the former defended Pope Martin for writing that the Holy Spirit proceeded 'ex patre filioque'. Maximos interpreted this by saying that the use of 'ex' did not make the Son the cause (αἰτία) of the Spirit for the μία αἰτία is the Father. By 'ex', Pope Martin, according to Maximos, wished to express δι' αὐτοῦ to demonstrate the co-mingling of the essence (ὁμοουσιότης τῆς οὐσίας). (22) Maximos himself used the formula δι' υἱοῦ. (23) For John of Damascus, the classical formula is ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ though the Spirit does not receive His existence from the Son (οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἔχει). (24)

After John of Damascus, the final clarification in the East is crystallised in the formula ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς. The only remaining

question is how δι' υἱοῦ is to be interpreted, both concerning the temporal mission and the mediation of the Son within the Godhead. (25) According to Photios, the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone (μυθολογεῖς τὸ πνεῦμα προέρχεσθαι τοῦ υἱοῦ). (26) Here, the Son participates in only the temporal mission of the Spirit but even John 16:14 means ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πατρὸς λήψεται rather than ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται. The projection (προβολή) of the Spirit is the hypostatical property of the Father alone with no mediation by the Son. What is perplexing is that Photios says nothing concerning the formula δι' υἱοῦ and those who follow him do likewise. (27)

By the mid-ninth century, the Trinitarian conceptions of the East and West had attained complete divergence. Directly related to this Trinitarian split were the two basic views of the eternal procession of the Spirit: ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς in the East and 'ex patre filioque' in the West. Perhaps it would be even more correct to say that it was the conflict between these two pneumatological formulae which actually exposed the rift in the theology of the Trinity. These two phrases represent two different solutions to the question of personal diversity in the Trinity. (28) Just as the disputes over the Person of Christ had disturbed the early Church, disagreement over the Holy Spirit brought theological unrest to the medieval Church.

By inserting the filioque into the Creed and insisting upon its correctness regarding the eternal procession of the Spirit, the West made the Father and Son a common principle of the Holy Spirit. This placed the common essence above the Persons of the Trinity and made the Persons subordinate to the essence. Furthermore, this confounded the Persons of Father and Son and made the Holy Spirit a link between the Two. (29) With the rise of scholasticism in the West, this doctrinal development became more evident. According to V. Lossky,

the principle of relations of opposition set forth by Thomas Aquinas provided the means to explain double procession in precise detail. (30) When the double procession is admitted, it presupposes: 1. that the relations forming the basis of the Person are to be defined by their mutual opposition, the First to the Second and those Two to the Third. 2. The First and Second Persons together are a non-personal unity in that they give rise to a further relation of opposition. 3. Therefore, the origin of the Persons is impersonal, having its real basis in one essence, differentiated by internal relations. Pre-eminence is thus given to the Unity of the Essence rather than to the Trinity of the Persons and the equality between the essence and the Persons is upset. (31) The result is no longer the Christian Trinity but Sabellianism (the persons are modes of the essence).

In the East, the relations of origin signify the Personal diversity of the Three but also indicate the essential identity. Distinguishing the Son and the Holy Spirit from the Father, Three Persons are still venerated because they are One with Him (the Father) and their consubstantiality is confessed. By emphasising the monarchy of the Father, equilibrium is maintained between the Nature and the Persons. To demonstrate this, Photios compared the Trinity to a pair of scales in which the needle represents the Father and the two platforms, the Son and Spirit. (32)

In thirteenth century Byzantium, the use of δι'υιοῦ was revived, not only in connection with the temporal mission of the Spirit but also with reference to the eternal (or hypostatic) procession of the Spirit. Within the tradition of Byzantine theology, this revival was permissible in the first case but in the second, it had to be condemned as an innovation, contrary to the teachings of the Church. Those who put forward this formula were the partisans of union who felt that

that this formula was one of concord, bringing agreement between East and West concerning the eternal procession of the Spirit. (33) But their view of the Trinity was not comparable to that of the adversaries of union in the East.

The principal proponents of 'through the Son' were Nikephoros Blemmydes and John Bekkos. Blemmydes wrote two tracts and adopted the argument from the West that without the participation of the Son in the procession of the Holy Spirit, no difference could be distinguished between the Son and Spirit. More importantly, Blemmydes examined the position of John of Damascus and went against the principle of Photios that the sending of the Spirit temporally was the hypostatic property of the Father alone. (34)

John Bekkos, who read Blemmydes assiduously during his imprisonment, represented the culmination of pneumatological error at Byzantium. He attempted to demonstrate that the prepositions *ἐκ* and *διὰ* were identical, contrary to the tradition of the Church as well as to grammar and expounded that the Son is the direct cause and the Father the indirect cause of the procession of the Spirit (summed up by the terms *αἷτιον ἀρχικόν* or *κυρίως αἷτιον*). If this were not the case, according to Bekkos, there would be two processions within the Godhead. Thus, he made *διὰ* applicable not only to the temporal mission of the Spirit but also to his eternal procession. (35)

The convocation of the Second Council of Blachernai under Gregory of Cyprus provided Bekkos with the ultimate opportunity to explain his pneumatological thought. As in his writings, his entire presentation depended upon the interchangeability of the prepositions *ἐκ* and *διὰ*. Since, in his opinion, the prepositions are identical, this enabled him to use the quotation from St. John of Damascus as part of his defense (*προβολεὺς διὰ λόγον ἐκφαντορικοῦ πνεύματος*). (36)

Explaining the word προβολεῦς as 'cause', he gave the Son an integral part in the eternal procession of the Spirit. Interchanging ἐκ for διὰ in the quotation, he could then demonstrate the admissibility of the filioque.

To justify its condemnation of Bekkos and the filioque, the Second Council of Blachernai had more than one problem which with to contend. The significance of the words ἐκ, διὰ, and προβολεῦς required elucidation as did the entire statement of John of Damascus. There was no difficulty in refuting the similitude of ἐκ and διὰ for, reading further in the text of Damascus, the statement 'We do not say the Spirit proceeds from the Son' appeared. (37) In contrast, the significance of διὰ still remained a stumbling block. Since the time of Photios, the formula ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς had been used without reference to δι' υἱοῦ. Some, such as Moschabar, were so convinced that this was immemorial practice that they refused to accept the authenticity of the quotation of Damascus. (38) To solve the dilemma, Gregory of Cyprus was appointed to write the conciliar tomos. In the tomos and the pneumatological works which followed it, the Patriarch displayed a keen knowledge of the past response to the problem of the procession.

The prologue to the tomos states its two objectives: 1. to define the Orthodox position in precise terms, and 2. to expose the foreign teachings which could be shunned by everyone if understood by everyone. (39) Immediately, Gregory addresses the problem of causality - the Son is not the cause of the Holy Spirit, either deparately or with the Father. (40) He thus denies Bekkos' claim of the Son as direct and the Father as indirect cause of the Spirit. In the eleven anathemas which follow, he develops his pneumatology in succinct terms as he condemns the views of Bekkos.

The core of Gregory's pneumatological thought is expounded in the third through fifth parts of the condemnation. He begins with the problem of Damascus' words: '... the quotation of John of Damascus that the Father is the Projector (προβολεύς) of the revealing Spirit through the Son.... means that the manifestation of the Spirit, who has His being from the Father, (is) through the Son'. (41)

He then explains 'manifestation' (φανέρωσις) : 'Those who maintain that the Comforter has his procession from the Father and from the Son.. support this (by) quoting the writings of some of the Fathers that the Spirit originates (ὑπάρχει) through and from the Son while these writings show his shining and manifestation. The Comforter shines eternally and manifests Himself (ἀναδείκνυται) through the Son in the way the sun's light shines through the intermediary of the sun's rays, giving and communicating Him (the Spirit) to us'. (42)

And finally, he compares the concept of manifestation with that of causality: 'It is the opinion of the Church and the saints that the Father is the root and source of the Son and the Holy Spirit and the eternal fountain of divinity, and the eternal source; if some of the saints have said the Spirit proceeds through the Son, this points to the eternal manifestation (αἰδιον ἔκφανειν) of the Spirit by the Son, not the unique personal procession, for there is the denial of the Theologian, all the Father has, so has the Son, except causality'. (43)

Although Gregory showed that it is solely the hypostasis of the Father that is the source of the Holy Spirit, those who refused to sign the tomos were confounded by the apparent contradiction of the term 'eternal manifestation'. They interpreted it as meaning that the Son participated in the eternal procession of the Spirit, that is, his actual

coming into being (πρόοδος εἰς τὸ εἶναι). Due to the sobriety and succinctness of Gregory's presentation, they felt his terminology ambiguous. Bekkos seized the accusation of ambiguity as an opportunity to condemn the tomos. Since Gregory had not given προβολεύς, a word which had been used by the Church to denote the Holy Spirit's natural existence, an 'isolated' definition in the tomos but had used it only in relation to his explanation of the quotation from John of Damascus, Bekkos attached various meanings to the word. These meanings, he felt, confirmed his belief (and that of those who refused to sign the tomos) of the similitude of πρόοδος (procession) and αἰδιος ἔκφανσις (eternal manifestation). (44)

Gregory realised that his argument for the eternal manifestation of the Spirit was being obscured by semantic squabbling. In his 'Apology', he mentioned this development and provided greater elucidation of his thought while demonstrating Bekkos' errors. He begins with an expression of astonishment at 'the many people who expound about God (and) what end their mass of words serves'. (45) Considering Bekkos' equation of πρόοδος with αἰδιος ἔκφανσις, he then poses a series of questions and answers which leads him to conclude: 'The Fathers, saying that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, did not mean by this that the Spirit has his origin through the Son. Because they call the Father the one origin, root, source and originator of the Son and the Spirit and other similar names which reveal all thought concerning the origin of the Spirit from the Son and through Him, these show that the Father is the origin of the Son and Spirit'. (46)

The Patriarch then refutes Bekkos' concept of the similitude of prepositions by calling it a rhetorical trick - 'The replacement of one word by another is so ridiculous that not even school children

or the simple folk speaking the Greek language would be fooled by it' (47) Using the language of grammar rather than of theology, he exposes Bekkos' semantic juggling as nothing more than a convenient tool for the distortion of the truth. (48)

Finally, Gregory arrives at the heart of the matter by defending his concept of manifestation through the Son. His defense is so rich in patristic sources that it must be quoted extensively:-

MPG 'The ancient Church Fathers, enlightened by the Spirit, said
142 the Holy Spirit is through the Son, but not one of these con-
258D tinued... that He proceeds through the Son but (they all say)
that through the Son, He shines (ἐκλάμπειν) is manifested
(φαγεροῦσθαι) has appeared (πεφηνέναι) goes forth (πρῶϊέναι)
is made known (γνωρίσθαι) and similar terms which simply
indicate his manifestation or shining through the Son but not
(His) existence which the Holy Spirit possesses only from the
Father as they all confess. You want proof and I am going to
give it to you. Here is what St. Basil says in the fourth dis-
course of his Antirrhetics: 'The Spirit is from God, the Apostle
clearly states, saying "We have received the Spirit that is
259A from God" (I Cor. 2:12). He (the Apostle) has clearly affirmed
the fact that the Spirit has appeared through the Son by calling
Him 'of the Son' (Gal. 4:6). In a letter to his brother Gregory
(of Nyssa), speaking of the difference between essence and
Hypostasis he writes: 'The Son, through Himself and with Himself
makes known the Spirit who proceeds from the Father, shining
forth from unbegotten light as the Sole Only. Begotten, the
Son through Himself.. And in his canonical epistles, the
following is found: 'The Holy Spirit is not before the Only
Begotten nor is He between the Son and the Father. If not
B from God and through Christ, He does not exist at all.'

. . . . Equally, in the letter to Ablabios, in the twenty-

second chapter of his books against Eunomios as in the twenty-sixth and thirty-sixth chapters of that book, he (St. Basil) says, 'The Holy Spirit is joined to the Son in terms of relationship on the level of the uncreated and has the cause of existence from the God of all

259DAnd here is what Gregory Thaumaturgos says and

260A also Athanasios. The first of these, expounding the revelation of the faith says, 'And one Holy Spirit, having existence from God and appearing to men through the Son.' And in another place, 'I believe in a perfect Holy Spirit supplied from God through the Son to the adopted.' Again in another place, 'The Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten of the Father, and the Spirit from the essence of the Son is eternally sent (αἰδίως ἐκπεμφθέντος).

Athanasios, on the one hand, in his exposure of the hypocrisy of Meletios and (Paul) of Samosata and, on the other, in his letter to Serapion writes - in the first, 'It would have been impossible for the Spirit to receive participation in the glory of the Trinity if He had not gone forth from the Father through the Son (μὴ προσδικῶς ὃν ἐκ Θεοῦ δι' υἱοῦ). In the second,

B the Spirit given and sent from (παρά) the Son is Himself One and not many, neither from many but only the one Spirit. Since there is one Son and living Word, the sanctifying and illuminating life must be one, perfect, and complete, being His energy and gift, which is said to proceed from the Father since, as is confessed by all, He shines out from the Word of the Father and is sent and given.' And what does Cyril say of all this? He says in his work to Ermeia, 'You speak of the Holy Spirit, poured forth naturally from God the Father through the Son.' And again he says, inquiring, 'To whom do you ascribe the Holy Spirit? To God the Father only or to

the Son? Or to each of them partially and to both since He is One, (being) from the Father through the Son on account of the identity of essence (διὰ τὴν ταυτότητα τῆς οὐσίας). And in his commentary on the Gospel of St. 260C John, 'Although the Holy Spirit goes forth (πρόεισι) from the Father yet He comes (έρχεται) through the Son and is His (the Son's) own (ιδιόν ἐστιν αὐτόν). And in the same work he says, 'We firmly believe that the Holy Spirit is not alien to the Son but one in essence with Him and going forth (προϊόν) from the Father through Him

261A In his interpretations of the Lord's Prayer, he (Maximos the Confessor) expressed this: 'The Son and the Holy Spirit coexist essentially with the Father, being from Him and in Him naturally as regards cause and principle (of being). And what St. John of Damascus says is even clearer. He says 'the Holy Spirit, also from the Father, not begotten but proceeding (οὐ γεννητῶς, ἀλλ' ἐκπορευτῶς).

C(and concerning the Spirit): 'We say that He is from the Father and we name Him the Spirit of the Father but we do not say the Spirit is from the Son although we name Him the Spirit of the Son for as the Apostle says "If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ.." We confess that He is manifested and given to us through the Son for He (Christ) said to the disciples, "Receive the Holy Spirit," just as the ray (ἄκτις) and radiance are from the sun, He is the source of light and radiance. Through the ray, the radiance is given us. It illuminates us and is shared by us....'.....In the work 'On the Divine Names', he

D (Pseudo-Dionysios) says the following: 'The Father is the source and cause of the Son and Spirit, the Father of the one Son and the Projector (προβολεύς) of the Spirit. The Son

is Word, Wisdom, and Strength, the figure, the reflection, the image of the Father and from the Father but not the Son of the Spirit - the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father since he proceeds from the Father. Nothing can be set in motion without the Spirit. And He is the Spirit of the Son, not in the sense
 262A that (He proceeds) from Him, but in the sense that He proceeds through Him from the Father; for the Father is the sole cause.' In the letter (to Jordanis) he says, 'For us there is one God the Father and His Word and His Spirit. The Word is born hypostatically, therefore He is the Son. The Spirit, proceeding hypostatically and projected (πρόβλημα), is from the Father and through the Son, but He is not from the Son. He is, as it were, the breath of His (the Father's) mouth, proclaiming the Word. And the Spirit is breath, that is released and poured out (πνοὴ λυομένη καὶ διαχεομένη)..... The unbegotten Father is the Begetter of the Son; for He (the Father) is not from anyone. The Son is the offspring of the Father since He is begotten from Him. The Holy Spirit (is the Spirit) of God the Father, as He proceeds from Him and is called the Spirit of the Son since through Him He is manifested and communicated to creation although not having existence from Him.'

This rich mine of patristic quotations which implies the participation of the Son in more than the temporal mission of the Spirit enabled Gregory to distinguish simultaneous actions within the Godhead: 'The passage of the Spirit into being from the Father (πρόοδος εἰς τὸ εἶναι) accompanies the manifestation of the Spirit through the Son in the way light shining from the sun is emitted and shown through the ray of the light.' (49)

But he is careful to clarify: 'For the assertion preferred by them (Bekkos and the 'Italians') (is that) this (ἐκφάνσις) means the same as existence (ὑπαρξις) Therefore we do not say existence in the tomos (when we mean) manifestation'. (50) Examining the etymology of the two words, Gregory demonstrates that no literate

individual could understand ἐκφανσις (from φαίνω, to appear) as ὑπαρξις (from ὑπάρχω, to exist). (51)

Now that Gregory had defended the idea of manifestation through the Son, it remained for Him to define the eternal nature of the concept. He concludes the 'Apology' with a theological 'tour de force':

266C 'Clearly, the Spirit is imparted, given and sent through the Son to those who are in a fit state to receive Him, by which He is sent (ἀποστέλλεται), imparted (κορηθεῖται), and given (δίδοται). But He is manifested (ἐκφαίνεται), shines (ἐκλάμπει) and is revealed (φανεροῦται) eternally.

D'The Son,' says St. Basil, 'makes known through Himself and with Himself the Spirit who proceeds from the Father. If then, He is made known eternally with the Son, from whom He is never separated, as is familiar to you (it follows that He is also made known) eternally through Him.' Gregory of Nyssa, among the distinctive characteristics of the Spirit which distinguish Him from the Father and the Son, mentions the fact that He appears and shines forth through the Son. Hence, if the Paraclete was never without His distinctive characteristics, as you know, then if you are sensible, you will say that He was never without the characteristic of appearing through the Son: for this is a characteristic that is distinctive to Him who is eternal (and so this characteristic cannot be) non-eternal. And this was clarified by Thaumaturgos in his teaching that 'the Holy Spirit is sent eternally through the Son from the essence of the Father.'

267A Athanasios and John of Damascus give us, as far as is possible, an image of the incomprehensible and invisible Trinity, and by means of this, they guide and lead us upwards, so far as they can, to an understanding of (the Trinity's) blessed nature: the first of these used the illustration of sun, effulgence, and light; the second, of sun, ray, and radiance. Do you think then, that they

held that the light and radiance go forth always through the effulgence and the ray, or are there occasions when it (the light and radiance) do not go out through it (the effulgence and ray)? And so when you hear that the Spirit is "of the Son" - in the sense that He has His existence from the Son - do you say then concerning the Spirit that He is "of the Son" in a temporal sense and from time to time and not eternally?

267B. I know you will say: 'not at all; He is the Spirit of the Son eternally and always but if the Spirit is Spirit of the Son eternally, and is said to be "of the Son" because He is manifested through the Son, then He who says that He is Spirit of the Son by virtue of the fact that He is manifested through the Son, also admits that He is manifested eternally through the Son.'

Gregory's position brought the first clarification of pneumatological doctrine at Byzantium since the time of Photios. Not only did he reinstate δι' υἱοῦ in its temporal sense, including the Spirit's mission to the world, but he gave it eternal significance. While doing this, he kept the 'monarchy' of the Father intact. By denying the scholastic principle of the relations of opposition which was inherent in Bekkos' theology, he preserved the distinctness of the hypostases in Byzantine Trinitarian thought. The eternal procession of the Spirit is still ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς (thus denying the filioque) but His temporal mission and eternal manifestation are δι' υἱοῦ.

The concept of light is the key to an understanding of eternal manifestation. Both the tomos and the 'Apology' are filled with allusions to light and it is through the concept of the radiance of light that Gregory arrives at the term 'manifestation'. Since ἐκφανσις had the verb φαίνω as its root, these words bore close relation to the word φῶς or φωτός (light). (52) Drawing upon the metaphor of the sun (Father-sun, Son-rays of light, Holy Spirit-the light given by the sun) which had

become common in Eastern thought to express the life of the Trinity, the light becomes more than a representation of the Trinity for Gregory. Through light, we perceive the manifestation of the Spirit: 'The Comforter.....manifests Himself through the Son in the way the sun's light shines through the intermediary of the sun's rays, giving and communicating Him (the Spirit) to us.' (53) And as St. John of Damascus says: 'Through the ray, the radiance is given us. It illuminates us and is shared by us.' (54) Even if man does not perceive this light, it still shines: 'Clearly, the Spirit is imparted, given and sent through the Son to those who are in a fit state to receive Him.....But He is manifested, shines, and revealed eternally.' (55) Gregory never elaborates in the tomos or the 'Apology' what this light is, but he implies this with the patristic sources he has used: 'The Spirit who proceeds singly from the Father shining from unbegotten light.' (St. Basil) (56) 'It would have been impossible for the Spirit to receive participation in the glory of the Trinity if He had not gone forth from the Father through the Son.' (St. Athanasios) (57) The concept of light in Gregory's theology signifies nothing less than the Divine Light itself. Through it, two planes of the Divine are recognised: the self existence of the Trinity (essence and hypostases) and the existence of the Trinity 'ad extra' in the radiance of the Glory of God. (58) Light is a property of God yet difficult to identify with either His essence or hypostases.

Following his resignation, Gregory dealt with this problem more fully in his composition 'Concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit'. (59) In it, he was able to construct a more precise pneumatology without the pressures of his patriarchate. Beginning with the self-existence of the Trinity, Gregory reiterates the view, expressed in his earlier writings, of the Spirit's procession solely from the hypostasis

of the Father while showing that the Spirit possesses the essence of the Son. (60) By confessing this, he can conclude: 'We say in effect that the Holy Spirit has his procession essentially from the Father and exists from His essence. Since the Father and Son are not of a different essence but of the same and unique essence, we necessarily confess that the Spirit is also from it'. (61)

According to Gregory, when St. Cyril mentions that the Holy Spirit proceeds 'naturally' from the Son (implying double procession), it is because the Spirit is consubstantial with the Son. (62) Sharing essence with the Son but having his hypostasis from the Father, the Spirit is temporally sent by the Son for He is, as Scripture says, 'The Spirit of the Son'. But since the Son shares in the essence of the Spirit, this must be expressed eternally and not only temporally. According to the apophatic theology of Byzantium, the essence of God is unknowable so it is neither the essence nor the hypostasis of the Spirit (which are from the Father) which the Son manifests. Because of this apophaticism, Gregory had to express the Spirit's eternal revelation (manifestation) through the Son only in terms of light and radiance.

Having used the self-existence of the Trinity as his point of reference, he concludes his 'De Processione' by explaining how light is the 'medium' of the Spirit's eternal manifestation. Drawing upon the concepts of resplendence and energy, he rejects a spatial scheme of the Trinity and instead adopts the concept of **manifestation** - communicated from the Father, by the Son, in the Holy Spirit. (63) Citing a text of St. Athanasios which presents the Spirit as the gift, energy, and resplendence of the Son, he writes: 'Energy, he (St. Athanasios) says, has its procession from the Father because by mutual consent it shines, is sent and given from the Word who is close to the

Father. Is it for this reason that the Spirit has procession from the Father because He is the energy and the gift of the Word? How will the gift be consubstantial with the donor? How are they one with regard to nature? How is the energy the same as the essence which gives it energy? How will it be its proper hypostasis if it is energy? Because the reason of the energy is incompatible with that. Besides all that, what do you say the Father is? Cause? But what of the Son? And Whom will you define as the cause and principle of the Holy Spirit? Could it be the Son since they are joined not by cause through themselves but by the Father? But where is this found in Scripture? And if the greater enhypostasised essence of the Paraclete is energy, are we, who receive the gift and resplendence, participating and caught in the essence? And what truth have those shown who say that the Divine is participable by the energies themselves and the resplendence? How is it that St. Athanasios says the way of the Spirit is made by energies and resplendences?' (64)

Here, Gregory distinguishes between essence and **manifestation**. Although the divine hypostases transcend the inaccessible existence of God, the non-identity of the Father and Spirit would remain intact without the participation of the Son. This is the gift of the Son - all 'energies' (for instance, the Grace of God) and all resplendences/manifestations (for instance, the Glory of God) come from the Father and go forth from the Godhead in the Holy Spirit but these are expressed in the Son. Gregory of Nazianzos clarifies this when he speaks of the Trinity as 'The True, the Truth, and the Spirit of Truth'. (65) Scripture demonstrates this when it speaks of the Father as 'the Father of glory' (Eph. 1:17), the Word as 'the brightness of His glory' (Heb. 1:17), and the Holy Spirit as 'the Spirit of glory' (I Peter 4:14). Temporally, only through the Son are the identities of the Father and the Spirit made known. Eternally, God is manifested through the

shining of his glory, which occurs even if man does not exist to receive it. (66) Divine Light is itself a 'manifestation' and through this Light, the Holy Spirit has been manifested eternally as have the other Two Persons of the Trinity.

Gregory's distinction between essence and 'manifestation' demonstrates how different the eternal procession of the Spirit proceeding from the Father alone is from His eternal radiance (or manifestation) showing forth the Glory and Grace of God through the Son. By 'manifestation' Gregory showed how man himself participated in the Divine Life through synergy. He was a precursor of Palamas whose own system would make use of the distinction, clarifying it by the terms 'energy' and 'essence'. The resplendence of the Glory of God in Gregory of Cyprus' theology would become the 'uncreated light' of Palamas' thought. (67)

Both the party of Moschabar and the commentary of Mark provide unfortunate footnotes to the pneumatological thought of Gregory of Cyprus. Both resulted from inaccurate readings of the tomos, which in turn, led to the semantic squabbling which ended Gregory's patriarchate. Following Bekkos' attack on the word *προβολεύς*, the party of Moschabar also attacked the use of the word. This group charged that Gregory had made *προβολεύς* a synonym for *ἐκφανείς*. Unlike Bekkos, they felt Gregory had established the difference between *πρόοδος* and *ἐκφανείς* but that he denied *προβολεύς* meant *αἴτιος* (originator). (68) When the monk Mark wrote his commentary, he also spoke of the similitude of *προβολεύς* and *ἐκφανείς*. (69)

Bekkos, Moschabar's group, and Mark had not understood Gregory's distinction between *ἐκπόρευσις* (procession) and *ἐκφανείς* (manifestation) because they were unable to see that the two actions are related and

occur simultaneously. Gregory had shown this in his 'Apology' but few seem to have taken the trouble to read it. (70) Because they could neither distinguish between the concepts nor conceive that they occur simultaneously, Gregory's opponents and even his supporter Mark tried to interpret his meaning by the definitions of words rather than the context of Gregory's remarks.

The commentary of Mark dramatically weakened the Patriarch's defense. Since he himself had read the monk's work and had not corrected its principal error, his enemies were quick to use this argument against him. Theoleptos of Philadelphia, John Cheilas of Ephesos, and Daniel of Kyzikos joined Moschabar's party principally because of the commentary. All of them had signed the tomos but with misgivings. Since the commentary confirmed the accusations of Moschabar's party, this enabled them to attack the Patriarch. When Cheilas arrived in Constantinople, the battle of words was heightened. His letter to the Emperor reveals how confused the semantic situation had become; it reads more like a lexicon than a letter. According to him, the works of Gregory and Mark showed that ὑπαρξίς, φανέρωσις, ἔκφανσις and ἔκλαμψις were synonyms for ἐκπόρευσις (and προβολή). (71)

Gregory's formal complaint to the Emperor and his disavowal of Mark's commentary came too late to save the Patriarch. In his letter to Andronikos II, he not only condemned the bishops but also 'the foolish paper of Mark'. (72) If, as Mark said, he had given procession a double interpretation, he should be anathematized. But since there was not a 'shadow of resemblance' between the Patriarch's writings and those of the monk, this could hardly be done. (73) In his 'Confession', Gregory presents the same defense, adding that because of preoccupation, he had not carefully read 'this work of an uncultured non-professional', overlooking the error that now condemned him. (74)

He reiterates that in the tomos, the expression 'through the Son' signifies the passage of the Spirit in eternal illumination and not in being. (75) These documents secured the confirmation of the Patriarch's Orthodoxy but still did not convince his opponents of the concept of eternal manifestation.

At Gregory's resignation, the semantic squabbling which had resulted from the tomos remained unresolved. Mark's own appearance before the Council at which Theoleptos presided supports this. Retracting what he said in his commentary, he also condemned Gregory's pneumatology, accusing the Patriarch and Bekkos of the same error! (76) Obviously, he still did not understand Gregory's thought. This confusion was further dramatised by the council convened by the Emperor after the resignation. The assembly was so thoroughly confused that it decided to expunge the passage of John of Damascus, the source of so much trouble. (77)

Byzantium was not prepared for the pneumatology of Gregory. The staunch traditionalism which had engulfed Byzantine society resulted not only from the renunciation of the Union of Lyons but also from the 'frozen' theology which had become prevalent in the East. With the challenge of the filioque, Byzantine theology looked for solutions in the context of an 'absolute' theological system that had existed since the time of Photios. The Fourth Crusade hardened the Byzantine position further, making distrust of the West commonplace. Instead of returning to patristic sources for answers, most were content to repeat the old formulae. Despite this trend, Gregory of Cyprus risked overwhelming opposition to reverse it. His immediate reward was resignation and isolation; it remained the task of succeeding generations to recognise his contribution.

Notes - Chapter Five

- (1) P. Sherrard, The Greek East and Latin West (London, 1959), p. 50.
Pp. 49-61 provide an illuminating account of the intellectual milieu which led to the filioque disagreement.
- (2) V. Lossky, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church, (London, 1957), p. 13.
- (3) Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingston (second edition, Oxford, 1974), p. 422.
- (4) Origen, Exegeticus in Joannem, MPG 14, cc. 128-9. Gregory Thaumaturgos, Exposito fidei, MPG 10, c 985; Beck, p. 307.
- (5) Athanasios, Oratio III Contra Arianos, MPG 26, c. 372A; G.B. Howard The Schism Between the Oriental and Western Churches (London, 1892), p. 7.
- (6) Athanasios, Oratio III Contra Arianos, MPG 26, c. 376AB; G.B. Howard, op. cit. n. 7, pp. 7-8.
- (7) Athanasios, Monarchia, MPG 25, c. 216A-D; G.B. Howard, op. cit. n. 7, p. 7.
- (8) Cyril of Alexandria, Thesaurus, MPG 75, c. 585A; Beck p. 307.
- (9) Op. cit. n. 3, p. 307.
- (10) J. Gill, article on the filioque, The New Catholic Encyclopedia (Washington, D.C., 1967), 5, p. 913, attributes this controversy to the tendency of the school of Antioch to interpret the Scriptures literally and to stress the distinction of Persons in the Trinity in opposition to Alexandria with its more analogic approach with insistence upon the unity of God.
- (11) V. Lossky, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church (London, 1957), p. 51.
- (12) Pseudo Dionysios, De divinis nominibus, MPG 3, c. 645B; V. Lossky, op. cit. n. 11, pp. 54-55.

- (13) K.T. Ware, The Orthodox Church (Penguin Books, 1963), p. 220.
- (14) Gregory of Nazianzos, *Theologica quinta* (Oratio 31): 'De Spiritu sancto', MPG 36, c. 141.
- (15) S. Runciman, The Great Church in Captivity (Cambridge, 1968), p.92.
- (16) J.N.D. Kelley, Early Christian Creeds (London, 1950), p. 359.
- (17) Augustine, *Homilia* 99, MPL 38, cc. 595-602; G.B. Howard op. cit., n. 7, p.13.
- (18) Ambrose, *De spiritu sancto*, MPL 16, c. 731; Howard pp. 10-11.
- (19) Gregory of Nazianzos, *Sanctum Baptisma*, MPG 36, c. 417; S. Runciman, op. cit. n. 15, p. 92.
- (20) Gregory of Nyssa, *Quod non sunt tres dii*, MPG 45, c. 133; J.N.D. Kelley, op. cit. n. 16, pp. 359-60.
- (21) Beck p. 308.
- (22) Maximos the Confessor, *Opuscula theologica*, MPG 91, c. 136B.
- (23) Maximos the Confessor, *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, MPG 90, c. 672C.
- (24) John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa*, MPG 94, c. 849A; John of Damascus, *Homilia in sabbatum sanctum*, MPG 96, c. 605.
- (25) Beck p. 311.
- (26) Photios, *Mystag.* 2, MPG 102, c. 281A.
- (27) Beck p. 311.
- (28) V. Lossky, À l'image et à la ressemblance de Dieu (Paris, 1967), p. 71 (English translation, In the Image and Likeness of God (St. Vladimir's Press, 1974), pp. 75-76). For a detailed presentation of the 'filioque' problem through the ninth century, cf. R. Haugh Photius and the Carolingians (Belmont, Mass., 1975).
- (29) V. Lossky, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church (London, 1957), p. 62.
- (30) V. Lossky, op. cit., n. 28, p. 72; English ed. p. 76.
- (31) V. Lossky, op. cit., n. 28, p. 72; English ed. pp. 76-77.

- (32) Photios, *Ad Amphiloichium*, MPG 101, c. 896; V. Lossky, *op. cit.* n. 28, p. 76; English ed. p. 81, n. 17.
- (33) V. Lossky, *op. cit.*, n. 28, p. 68; English ed. p. 73.
- (34) Blermydes often seems confused concerning terminology; however cf. *De Processione* MPG 142 c. 540
- (35) Pachymeres I, p. 481; J. Bekkos, *De unione*, MPG 141, c. 30; Beck p. 316.
- (36) John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa*, MPG 94, c. 808B; Pachymeres II, p. 31.
- (37) Comparable to ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἔχει, MPG 96, c. 605.
- (38) Cf. above, chapter four, n. 52.
- (39) *Tomus fidei*, MPG 142, c. 235B.
- (40) *Ibid.*, c. 236C.
- (41) *Ibid.*, c. 240A, and compare with Damascus' remarks above p. 133.
- (42) *Ibid.*, c. 240BC.
- (43) *Ibid.*, c. 241A, and compare with Nazianzos' remarks above, p. 132. and MPG 36, c. 252A.
- (44) Pachymeres II, pp. 112-114.
- (45) *Apologia*, MPG 142, c. 251C.
- (46) *Ibid.*, cc. 255A, 256CD.
- (47) *Ibid.*, c. 257B.
- (48) *Ibid.* c. 257BC.
- (49) *Ibid.*, 262D.
- (50) *Ibid.*, 265C.
- (51) *Ibid.*, cc. 265D-266A.
- (52) *Ibid.*, cc. 265D-266A.
- (53) *Tomus fidei*, c. 240C.
- (54) *Apologia*, c. 261C.
- (55) *Ibid.*, c. 266C.
- (56) *Ibid.*, c. 259A.

- (57) Ibid., c. 260A.
- (58) V. Lossky, À l'image et à la ressemblance de Dieu (Paris, 1967), p. 87. (English translation, In the Image and Likeness of God (St. Vladimir's Press, 1974), p. 91).
- (59) De Processione, MPG 142, cc. 269-300.
- (60) Ibid., cc. 270D-272B; O. Clement, 'Grégoire de Chypre, de l'ekporèse de Saint Esprit', Istina 3-4(1972), pp. 444-446.
- (61) De Processione, c. 272B.
- (62) Ibid., c. 272CD and cf. above p. 133 concerning the comingling of the essence in the Trinitarian thought of Maximos the Confessor.
- (63) O. Clement, op. cit. n. 60, p. 448.
- (64) De Processione, cc. 289D-290A; French translation in O. Clement, op. cit., n. 60, p. 450. The quotation from St. Athanasios was also cited by Gregory in the Apologia, c. 260B.
- (65) Gregory of Nazianzos, Or. 23, MPG 35, c. 1164A; V. Lossky, op. cit. n. 59, p. 87; English ed., p. 91.
- (66) Gregory implies this in the Apologia, c. 266C.
- (67) Following Gregory's discussion, the final section of the De Processione contrasts Byzantine and Latin pneumatological views, repeating much of what Gregory has discussed previously. The repetition suggests that this section (cc. 290B-300B) may be Mouzalon's own remarks concerning Gregory's pneumatology. Cf. above, chapter four, n. 82.
- (68) Cf. above, pp. 105-106.
- (69) Cf. above, p. 108 and the Confessio, MPG 142, c. 250AB.
- (70) Apologia, MPG 142, c. 262D. Cf. above, n. 49. This document is not mentioned by the Byzantine historians.

- (71) J. Cheilas, Letter to the Emperor Andronikos II, MPG 142, c. 245C;
an English translation appears in the appendix of this thesis.
- (72) Pittakion, MPG 142, c. 268A, C.
- (73) Ibid., c. 268CD; Confessio, c. 250D.
- (74) Confessio, cc. 249D-250A.
- (75) Ibid., c. 250A.
- (76) A. Papadakis 'Gregory II of Cyprus And Mark's Report Again', Greek Orthodox Theological Review 21(1976), pp. 151, 157.
- (77) Cf. above, p.115.

VI. Gregory's Letters: A Reflection of His Intellectual Milieu

The vast bulk of Gregory's correspondence enables the reader to enter the intellectual world of late thirteenth century Byzantium and to experience in particular the revival of classical studies taking place at Constantinople and elsewhere. Byzantine epistolography has been called 'practice in a dead language' and the correspondence of Gregory of Cyprus often demonstrates this.^(a) From the earliest instruction on Greek literary letters by Philostratos in the time of the Second Sophists until the Palaiologan period, the concept of the letter underwent radical change in the East. What had originally been letters written in a style between Attic Greek and the colloquial speech of the day were transformed into rhetorical pieces which stressed 'mimesis' of the classical authors as their most important aspect. Form rather than content usually assumed greater importance for the writer.

By Gregory's time, this metamorphosis was complete- letters rarely showed the writer's personality but rather his ability as a rhetorician. From Libanios to Psellos, the idea of the letter as *θέατρον*, a showplace for the imitation of the Attic style spread.^(b) This had occurred to such an extent that Gregory of Cyprus felt it necessary to apologise when lack of time forced him to write a letter in colloquial speech.^(c)

The rhetorical emphasis in epistolography also caused writers to consider prolixity as a true mark of quality. By the eleventh century, the succinctness of early letter writing was all but wiped away with Psellos' demands that his rhetorical thirst be assuaged by longer and longer letters from his correspondents. (d) Many of Gregory's letters are the direct descendants of such an attitude. One of them is so involved that even modern editors remain confused by it. (e.) There are instances where he does simplify his style but such attempts were not looked upon very favourably by his fellow rhetoricians. (f.) Because of their affectation and obtruseness, the letters of Gregory of Cyprus contain more prolixity than information, but 'kernels' of information concerning the intellectual life of late thirteenth-century Byzantium do surface in them, especially with regard to books and bookmen.

The actual text of Gregory's autobiography may have been meant to serve as an introduction to his collection of letters. (g) These letters have special importance not only because they form one of the few sets of patriarchal correspondence to survive (in addition to those of Photios, Nicholas I, and Athanasios I), but also because their number presents examples of almost every type of Byzantine letter. Hunger has recently classified Byzantine epistolography into four general categories: official, private, literary, and private-literary letters. (h) In the correspondence of Gregory of Cyprus, examples in each category are to be found. Because of his duties in the palace as protapostolarios and his patriarchate, many official letters had to be written by Gregory to high officials such as the Grand Logothete or Emperor. These follow a very formal structure and could be compared to the modern business letter. (i) The number of purely 'private' letters in the correspondence

is very small. These do not use the general rhetorical format but deliver a message or request in a straightforward fashion. Some of the letters which Raoulaina received from Gregory fall into this category as do letters to Methodios the monk and John Phakrases. (j) Purely literary letters are represented by the set pieces addressed to the 'speakers' of Gregory's rhetorical circle. (k) These are usually constructed as discourses of an involved syntactical nature.

By far the largest category represented in Gregory's collection are the private-literary letters. Friendship, particularly in the Raoulaina correspondence, emerges as the great theme in many of these letters: 'if you are well, so am I', Gregory writes to his correspondents. (l) Constant concern for friends, especially when they have not written for sometime, becomes a common motif. (m) Likewise, when one of the correspondents is ill, the minutest detail of the malady is shared in a letter so that the recipient can comiserate. (n) This attitude explains the many letters which Gregory wrote concerning his recurrent health problems; they were a type of therapy which might be enhanced by a friend's reply through a letter of consolation. (o) Despite its rhetorical structure, the letter became the highest mark of friendship at Byzantium, a vehicle expressing the highest degree of mutual concern on the part of correspondents. In addition to those many gifts sent with letters as in the Gregory-Raoulaina correspondence, the letter itself became a 'gift' to be cherished.

The final question which remains to be posed concerning Gregory's correspondence is why he arranged it into a collection for the scrutiny of future generations. First of all, according to the Patriarch, it represented a legacy to be bequeathed to his spiritual children. (p) After examining the rhetorical bulk of Gregory's corpus of letters, it also seems evident that he meant it as a monument to his Attic style.

As such, it was not ignored, for the tradition of the rhetorical letter at Byzantium continued at Byzantium following Gregory's death. (q)
 Not only the huge number of letters written by individuals such as Michael Gabras and Matthew of Ephesos testify to this, but also the chapter on letterwriting which Joseph the Philosopher placed in his rhetorical handbook. (r)

The recipients of the letters of Gregory have been described as a veritable 'who's who' of late thirteenth century Byzantium. (s)
 His correspondents demonstrate that Gregory was in touch with some of the most important men of letters and ecclesiastics of his day while he taught at Constantinople. In addition to those who lived at Constantinople such as Constantine Meliteniotes, George Pachymeres, Manuel Holobolos (prior to his exile), and Gregory's students, he corresponded with people throughout the Empire. Prior to his patriarchate, the more prominent included:-

1. Metropolitan Isaak of Ephesos - a friend and a patron who sent books to Gregory. (t)
2. Methodios the monk - the author of the anti-Arsenite tract $\delta\tau\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon\tau\iota\ \epsilon\chi\iota\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \lambda\alpha\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta\alpha\pi\omicron\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\ \delta\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon$ and an Attic stylist. (u)
3. John Pediasimos - the chartophylax and $\delta\pi\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\ \phi\iota\lambda\omicron\varsigma\acute{o}\phi\omega\upsilon$ of Ohrid who also wrote texts on canon law. (v)
4. Theodosios Saponopoulos - a learned monk and future Metropolitan of Naupaktos who wrote a commentary on the Pauline epistles. (w).
5. John Stavrakios - the erudite deacon and chartophylax of Thessaloniki whose enkomion to St. Demetrios has survived. (x)

6. Theodore Skutariotes- a bibliophile who acquired one of the largest private collections of books in thirteenth century Byzantium and became Bishop of Kyzikos.(y)

7. Demetrios Veaskos- apoeet and composer who also served as referendarios of Thessaloniki and later became Metropolitan of that city. He set to music the verses to St. Demetrios by Stavrakios.(z)

Following Gregory's promotion to the Patriarchate, most of the letters he wrote concern ecclesiastical matters but we know that his classical interests continued. When the more fully 'classical' aspect of his earlier life is contrasted with his career as Patriarch, it would seem that as a churchman his sole occupation was with theological matters. Examining his letters to Theodora Raoulaina, however, Gregory's continuing classical interests during the course of his Patriarchate become obvious. Both these letters and the life of Raoulaina herself constitute an important witness to intellectual life at Constantinople in the 1280's and merit close attention.

Raoulaina's name will be recalled from the list of people that Pachymeres gives as participants in the Council of Adramyttion.(1) She was a fervent Arsenite, a paradoxical fact in light of her classical erudition. The Arsenites were usually diametrically opposed to secular learning in any form. Her support of Gregory probably began at Adramyttion when the moderate Arsenite party was reconciled to the official Church.(2) Gregory further placated this group by allowing the body of Arsenios to be brought to Constantinople.(3) A year later(1285), the Patriarch permitted Raoulaina to place the body in a shrine at her own Monastery of St. Andrew.(4) This act of kindness cemented Gregory's friendship with her.

Born about 1240, Theodora Raoulaina was the daughter of John Kantakouzenos and Eirene Eulogia Palaiologina, the sister of Michael VIII. As the niece of Michael VIII and the cousin of Andronikos II, she was prominent in court circles, not only because of her birth, but because of her marriages to two successive protovestiarioi, George Mouzalon (+1258) and John Raoul (+before 1274). (5) Even after the death of Raoul, she still carried the title 'protovestiarissa'. Deeply involved in anti-unionist and Arsenite activities, she eventually retired from active participation in these movements when she became a nun with the name Kyriake. (6) The year of this event is not known but it could very well date from the time of her restoration of the Monastery of St. Andrew in Krisei. Her re-establishment of that foundation probably dates from approximately 1284. (7)

As an educated Byzantine noblewoman in the tradition of Anna Komnene, Theodora Raoulaina has left a number of works which verify her scholarly interests. One of her own literary compositions which survives is a vita of SS Theophanes Omologetes and his brother Theodore, iconodules persecuted in the ninth century, (8) Her rich library of manuscripts included a copy of the Orations of Aelius Aristides which she copied in her own hand. (9) Not only did she concern herself with the acquisition of manuscripts for her own library, she also donated manuscripts to other libraries. Among these was a codex which she presented to the Great Lavra of Mount Athos. (10) Despite the number of manuscripts which have survived her, neither her letters nor any autobiographical materials remain. An especially important question that might be answered by such a discovery would be where she acquired her literary education.

Raoulaina's greatest contact with Gregory occurred during the final part of his patriarchate and the last year of his life following his abdication in 1289, but there is at least one document which shows that they corresponded prior to this time. It is a letter of condolence to Raoulaina and her sister Anne upon the death of their mother Eireno Eulogia. (11) This document has been dated as late as 1284 and comes from the Patriarch at Adramyttion. (12) Raoulaina and her sister have already returned to Constantinople, so the letter proves that a friendly rapport already existed between Theodora and Gregory immediately after the council. All of the other letters date from the late 1280's but only a portion of them have been examined. Their tone and content reveal a close friendship between the Patriarch and the protovestiarissa. With these letters to hand, Gregory's retirement to the monydrion of Aristine near St. Andrew in Krisai becomes clearly understandable: it was the last place in Constantinople where he felt welcome. (13)

Most of the twenty-nine letters have remained unedited. The first to examine them was S. Kugeas earlier in this century but he used Codex Lugdunensis graecus 49 instead of the much more complete Vaticanus graecus 1085. (14) Ignoring the manuscript tradition, he mistakenly assumed that there were only eighteen letters. Of the eighteen letters which he found in the Leyden codex, he edited four of them completely. (15) S. Eustratiades, using Codex Vindobensis Philol. Graecus 195, found only four letters, which he edited. (16) One of these had already been edited by Kugeas, so Eustratiades added only three more to Kugeas' four. (17) Obviously, the Vienna codex was even less useful than the Leyden. While Kugeas and Eustratiades did their research, scholars awaited a complete edition of Gregory's letters which M. Treu had been promising for some twenty years. (18) He never produced it, so the actual number of letters to Raoulaina remained unknown until W. Laneoro

provided a definitive research tool with the publication of his La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre in 1937.

Although this work does not offer editions of the letters, it does contain useful tables which aid in sorting out the letters still in manuscript. It presents only numerical data - addresses, contents, and the like are arrived at only by consulting the manuscripts themselves.

Since it takes into consideration all the manuscripts of Gregory's letters, Lameere's chronology has proven dependable in most instances. There are occasions when he has misplaced some of the 247 documents but this is not surprising, considering the bulk of the material. (19) In both Lameere's chronology and in Vaticanus graecus 1085, the oldest manuscript of the correspondence, 27 of the 29 letters to Raoulaina come at the end. According to Lameere, the material falls into two distinct parts (Lameere letters 201-207, 209-215; and 227-239), separated by eleven letters to various other people (Lameere letters 216-226). (20) Using the three letters to John Cheilas (Lameere 219-221) in the middle group as a point of reference, a rough calculation of the dates of the two groups of letters can be made. (21) Since the Cheilas letters can be dated approximately mid-1288, this means the first group of letters to Raoulaina dates from before this time while the second group comes later, at the end of Gregory's patriarchate.

In examining these letters, the primary concern here is to highlight the classical 'strain' found in them. Their very existence confirms that the Patriarch continued to refine his Attic style, even during the times of greatest ecclesiastical distress. As a prolegomenon to this classical aspect of Gregory's ecclesiastical career, an earlier patriarchal letter to Constantine Akropolites is especially enlightening. (22) In it, a manuscript of Aristeides is mentioned but the Patriarch states that he has not really had an opportunity to study it because his ecclesiastical

duties have taken up most of his time. This letter confirms that Gregory as Patriarch was attempting to continue his classical studies prior to his letters to Raoulaina. Like most Byzantine epistolography, the Raoulaina letters surrender the useful information they contain grudgingly. While trying to follow the 'classical strain' through them, other material will surface, some of it interesting and much of it prosaic.

The first group of letters to Raoulaina commences with a piece in which Gregory expresses his deep concern that the best style possible be used when writing. When writing, beauty is attained by the use of subtleties. Such beauty draws upon wisdom and learning, acquisitions far more valuable than material things. (23) This concern with style on the Patriarch's part demonstrates that his rhetorical interests were continuing despite ecclesiastical duties. In the next letter, Gregory speaks of the enjoyment of discourses (λόγοι) but the reality of his current predicament in the Church breaks his scholarly reflection and ends the work on a note of despair: 'Oh, that books and studies would cause the departure of duties, the departure of the perception of labours and grief, and the warding off of troubles'. (24)

Gregory's next three letters have a less scholarly tone but show the closeness of his friendship with Raoulaina. In one of them, he politely reprimands her for not being in touch with him and anxiously inquires after her health and that of her community. (25) His concern eventually elicits a response from her which he acknowledges. (26) Later, he sends her a note wishing her success and luck. (27) Finally, she sends him a very well thought-out letter. The Patriarch writes of his satisfaction with it: both the expression of thoughts and the artistic arrangement are laudable. (28) Although he was no longer teaching, this letter reveals that Gregory took the time to supervise the rhetorical progress of a writer such as Raoulaina. Appropriately enough, he closes his

message with a blessing which names the three Holy Hierarchs, Gregory of Nazianzos, Basil the Great, and John Chrysostom. For Byzantines, these were not only the greatest Christian teachers but the foremost Christian rhetoricians.

Much of the remainder of the first group of letters contains prosaic details of daily life. In Lamere 207, Gregory has been given some melons by a monk from Peraia and announces to Raoulaina that he is sending her some. (29) In ensuing letters, he sends her fruit once again and also some fish which he has received from another monk. (30) With these presentations of gifts to Raoulaina, Gregory tried to show his appreciation; in one letter, the Patriarch mentions that a merchant friend of his has come into port and asks if the protovestiarissa requires anything. (31) This appreciation for Raoulaina's friendship and support is poignantly expressed in this set of letters. Asking her to come and visit him, Gregory speaks of her as being 'like his only child'. (32) Two other letters concern the recurrent health problems which the Patriarch suffered throughout this period. Since Raoulaina must have been aware of Gregory's delicate condition, he complains when she does not ask after his health. (33) Sometimes the pain he suffered, especially from his dropsy, was very great. (34)

One other letter of this period reasserts the classical strain of the Gregory-Raoulaina correspondence. It concerns the sending of books to a binder for repair. Despairing over the maltreatment of books and their resulting deterioration, the Patriarch tells Raoulaina that he has just received two newly bound books and is sending both of them to her. (35) In addition to his rhetorical interests, Gregory as Patriarch was also still involved in the search for and preservation of important texts. Although the information is not given in this letter, these books were probably classical texts.

In the interim period between the two sets of letters, the Patriarch's situation worsened dramatically. The desertion of John Cheilas meant that he was now completely alone in the battle raging against him over the Orthodoxy of his theology. (36) His health also continued to deteriorate; two letters to his doctor John verify this. (37) Finally the ongoing Arsenite disruptions in Constantinople were now aimed directly at him in the hope that he would abdicate the patriarchal throne. If the Patriarch would do this, the Arsenites promised to end their agitation. To test their sincerity, Gregory retired to the Hodegetria Monastery. (38) The inception of the second group of letters to Raoulaina may date from this time of semi-retirement.

Gregory had probably chosen the Hodegetria as a place of 'retirement' for several reasons. In addition to its peaceful seclusion which enabled him to continue fulfilling his duties as Patriarch unhindered, he could use its library and scriptorium whenever the press of his duties lightened. (39) Sheltered at the Hodegetria from the increasing controversy which enveloped Constantinople, use of these facilities may have provided some small bit of pleasure for an otherwise harried Patriarch. The first two letters of the second set of the Raoulaina correspondence, possibly written from the Hodegetria, reveal further classical concerns on the part of the Patriarch. In the first, he mentions passing along some books containing works of Aristeides and Demosthenes. (40) Although the titles of the works are not given by Gregory, he speaks at length of their rhetorical value, especially the writings of Demosthenes.

Probably the most interesting of all the Raoulaina letters is the next letter, a lengthy piece which presents much information. (41) Written in a very involved style, it begins with Gregory's response to Raoulaina's complaint that some of his letters have been written

in too simple (!) a style. Style aside, the Patriarch stresses the primary importance of the thought or substance which any letter contains. Reading on, it seems that Raoulaina has become impatient with waiting for a scribe to copy a volume of Demosthenes for her. Gregory explains that there will be no parchment available until the spring slaughter of sheep. Nonetheless, the Patriarch has given Raoulaina's orders to the scribe Melitas, who, he assures her, will do a good job. (42)

Most of the remaining letters of this group are not nearly as interesting as these first two. Once again, Gregory sends Raoulaina some fruit. (43) Later, he writes her notes of thanks for gifts of fish and fruit which the protovestiarissa has made to him. (44) Another letter in the same vein bestows a blessing upon her and sends best wishes in all her endeavours. (45) In one letter, the Patriarch expresses his delight in receiving letters - the more he receives them the more he expects them and relishes them. (46) Two discourses on mulberries are also found among these compositions, almost all of them very brief in length. (47)

Two very lengthy epistles close the entire sequence of letters to Raoulaina. Both seem to have been written near the end of Gregory's patriarchate and convey his feelings of despair and resignation. The first of these is yet another letter concerning the Patriarch's bad health. (48) Giving details of his symptoms, he bewails the pain and difficulties he constantly suffers. In the final letter, there is a feeling of isolation. (49) Written from afar, the letter might have been composed during Gregory's time at a house attached to the Monastery of St. Paul on Mount Latros. (50) Since the Monastery of St. Paul does not figure prominently in the list of major monasteries on Mount Latros, it must have been a very small foundation. (51) In his letter the Patriarch describes the shabbiness of his present habitation, thereby

suggesting that he was living elsewhere when writing to Raoulaina previously. While complaining a great deal, the Patriarch still praises 'the marvelous elder Elias', who may have been in charge of this monastic establishment.

After his voluntary abdication and departure from the Patriarchate, Gregory spent the final year of his life near Raoulaina's Monastery of St. Andrew in Krisei. Since she was close at hand and the monydrion of Aristine where the former Patriarch lived also housed her library, they both must have had more time for their literary discussions and pursuits. Until his death, Gregory remained a classical literateur and Raoulaina continued to expand upon her own classical interests, even after his passing.

Following Gregory's death, the protovestiarissa's literary circle included both Nikephoros Choumnos, a former pupil of Gregory of Cyprus and Maximos Planoudes, a monk who taught at the Chora. They corresponded with her concerning literary matters in much the same way that Gregory had. (52) Planoudes also wrote three epigrams to Raoulaina, praising both her and her monastic foundation. (53) Until her death in 1300, Raoulaina's primary concerns continued to be her literary interests and her monastery. She did leave Constantinople once during this period (1296) when she was sent by Andronikos II to Asia Minor to negotiate with the rebel Alexios Tarchaniotes Philanthropenos. (54) Despite her cloistered life, she still had a voice in political affairs, although her involvement was much more limited than earlier in life.

The remarkable correspondence between Gregory and Raoulaina throws light upon cultural life in late thirteenth century Byzantium. The ongoing theological crisis from which the pneumatology of Gregory of Cyprus emerged demonstrates the vitality of theological thought and the ecclesiastical estate in general but all of Constantinople seems caught up in this and only this aspect of cultural life. The concern for

decent schools of higher learning, classical education, and continuing classical research, so prominent in the 1260's and 70's, drops out of the picture completely in the sources for the 1280's. (55) Practically the only hint of these aspects of Byzantine civilisation stems from the Raoulaina correspondence. (56) From it, we know that the quest for the perfection of an Attic style continued, that the copying of classical texts had not ceased, that the search for and preservation of such texts still concerned scholars, and that rhetorical instruction, if only through correspondence, was still available.

Even when the Raoulaina correspondence yields no particularly useful information, it still retains a charming quality. Although Byzantine epistolography very often is stiff and formal, the human element occasionally surfaces in these letters, even if only fleetingly. The fact that a woman such as Raoulaina could be so literate in the early Palaiologan period underlines the extraordinary continuity of the Byzantine literary tradition. The setting for her classical literary activities makes her erudition all the more extraordinary - the nun Kyriake, pursuing classical research within her monastery, using her own private library of classical authors, and consulting the Patriarch of the Byzantine Church for rhetorical instruction. While Gregory and Raoulaina were both ecclesiastics, they were also both classicists. This duality permeates the cultural life of late thirteenth century Byzantium. Despite the unrest of the Arsenites, the internal problems caused by the Union of Lyons, and the revolt against Gregory's pneumatology, classical studies continued, not in spite of the Church but because of the Church.

Notes - Chapter Six

- (a) R.J.H. Jenkins 'The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Literature', DOP 17(1963), p. 45.
- (b) H. Hunger Die Hochsprachliche Literatur der Byzantiner I (Munich, 1978), pp. 199-201, 210. For a general survey of the problem, cf. also J. Sykoutres 'Problem der byzantinischen Epistolographie', Actes du IIIe congres international d'etudes byzantines (Athens, 1932) pp. 295-310. For the concept of mimesis, cf. H. Hunger 'On the Imitation (Μίμησις) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature', DOP 23-24 (1969-70), pp. 15-38.
- (c) Eustratiades Letter 64, 2, pp. 207-209.
- (d) Psellos Letter 87, quoted in H. Hunger, op. cit. note b, p. 220.
- (e) Compare Eustratiades Letter 187, 5, pp. 450-451 and S. Kugeas 'Zur Geschichte der Münchener Thukydideshandschrift Augustanus F', BZ 16(1907), pp. 598-600.
- (f) Eustratiades Letter 73, 3, pp. 11-12 exemplifies a simple letter. From Eustratiades Letter 187, 5, p. 450, we know that the protvestiarissa Theodora Raoulaina criticised his simple style. Cf. below pp. 163-164.
- (g) Eustratiades, Letter 155, 4, p. 113 and W. Lameere La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre (Brussels, 1937), p. 9.
- (h) H. Hunger, op. cit. note b, pp. 203-206.
- (i) Cf. esp. Eustratiades, Letters 120, 125, 127-129, 132-134, 144, 146, 164.
- (j) Eustratiades Letters 73 and 102. Although Letter 102 to Phakrases is not a rhetorical piece, it still echoes a theme of Libanios concerning the scarcity of parchment!

- (k) Eustratiades Letters 40, 41, 91, 195; Lameere 127, Vat. gr. fol. 29v (letter 127), Lameere 222, Vat. gr. 1035, fol. 265r (Letter 213). It should also be noted that H. Hunger, op. cit. note b, p. 203, mentions Gregory's two declamatic replies to Libanios as prime examples of the literary 'letter'.
- (l) Eustratiades Letters 6, 14, 90, 140.
- (m) Lameere Letter 203, Vat. gr. 1085, fols. 258v and 259r (Letter 195).
- (n) Cf. notes 37-41, chapter three and notes, 33, 34, 37 and 48 below.
- (o) H. Hunger, op. cit. note b, p. 225, makes this remark in a more general context.
- (p) Eustratiades Letter 155, 4, p. 113.
- (q) It should be stressed that the correspondence of Athanasios I is not the successor to Gregory's corpus since his letters are of a 'colloquial' nature.
- (r) Ed. G. Fatouros, Die Briefe des Michael Gabras (ca 1290- nach 1350) (Vienna, 1973); ed. D. Reinschi, Die Briefe des Matthaïos von Ephesos im Codex Vindobonensis Theol. Gr. 174 (Berlin, 1974); Joseph the Philosopher, 'Rhetorical Handbook', ed. Ch. Walz, Rhetores graeci (new edition: Osnabruck, 1968) 3, 558f.
- (s) A. Papadakis, 'Gregory II of Cyprus and an Unpublished Report to the Synod,' GRBS 16, 2(1975), p. 228.

- (t) Eustratiades Letter 9 and Introduction pp. 82-83.
- (u) Eustratiades Letters 73, 100, 101, (152, 171); Beck p. 687; Eustratiades Introduction pp. 84-85; Sykoutres 5, pp. 117-118. Methodios may have been part of Gregory's circle in the capital at this time but this is not certain.
- (v) Eustratiades Letter 35; Beck p. 710; Eustratiades Introduction p. 87; Krumbacher p. 566; V. Laurent 'logendes sigillo-graphiques et familles byzantines', EO 31(1932), p. 329.
- (w) Eustratiades Letters 63-65, 80, 86; Beck p. 650; Eustratiades Introduction p. 88. Cf. Pachymeres ii, p. 25 and Régestes 1495 for mention.
- (x) Eustratiades Letter 12, 20-23, 28, 76, 77, 82, 99, 106; Beck pp. 689, 703; Eustratiades Introduction p. 86.
- (y) Eustratiades, Letters 30, 58, Introduction p. 88; Krumbacher p. 176; N.G. Wilson 'Books and Readers in Byzantium', Byzantine Books and Bookmen (Washington, D.C. 1975), p. 8.
- (z) Eustratiades Letter 7; Beck p. 703; Eustratiades Introduction pp. 88-89; Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit 2 ed. E. Trapp (vienna, 1977), p. 50.

- (1) Pachymeres II, p. 59 and cf. above p. 98.
- (2) Gregoras I, p. 167; Pachymeres II, p. 64; and see above p. 99.
- (3) Gregoras I, p. 167; Pachymeres II, pp. 84-85 and cf. above p. 100.
- (4) Gregoras I, p. 167; Pachymeres II, pp. 85-86.
- (5) Akropolites I, pp. 118, 124; Gregoras I, p. 167; Pachymeres I, pp. 23-24, 62, 108.

For full biographical notices on Raoulaina, cf. S. Fassoulakis, The Byzantine Family of Raoul-Ral(1)es (Athens, 1973), n. 11, pp. 25-27; S. Kugeas 'Zur Geschichte der Münchener Thukydideshandschrift Augustanus F', BZ 16(1907), pp. 588-609; and D.M. Nicol The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos (Washington D.C., 1968), pp. 16-19.

- (6) Her tonsure is not mentioned by any of the Byzantine historians but is known from a note on a manuscript of Thucydides, Mon. gr. 430F. Cf. Kugeas, op. cit., n. 5.
- (7) Janin, pp. 28 and 31 assumes that the date is probably before and not after 1284. It seems that Raoulaina had not yet entered the monastic estate at the time of Adramyttion and the return of Arsenios' body to Constantinople (1284). A year later (1285), however, she asks that Arsenios' body be removed to St. Andrew in Krisei, her foundation. Evidently, the restoration had been completed between these two events and perhaps her tonsure as well.
- (8) Ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 'Ανάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας 4, pp. 185-223 and 5, pp. 397-399; S. Kugeas, op. cit. n. 5, p. 593.
- (9) Vat. gr. 1899, mention in Kugeas, op. cit. n. 5, p. 594 and Nicol, op. cit. n. 5, p. 17.
- (10) Paris. Coislin. 128 mentions Raoulaina as the donor of the manuscript; Fassoulakis, op. cit., n.5, p. 26.

- (11) Eustratiades Letter 158, 4, pp. 116-118; *Régestes* 1477.
- (12) Cf. V. Laurent 'La date de la mort d'Irène Eulogie, la sœur de Michel VIII Paléologue', *REB* 27(1969), pp. 209-213.
- (13) Gregoras I, pp. 177-178; Pachymeres II, p. 133.
- (14) S. Kugeas 'Zur Geschichte der Münchener Thukydideshandschrift Augustanus F', *BZ* 16(1907), pp. 595-600. Even the most recent work to examine the letters of Gregory, G. Fatouros 'Textkritische Beobachtungen zu den Briefen des Gregorios Kyprios', *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neellenici*, 12-13(1975-76), pp. 109-116, ignores the letters in manuscript but offers only textual criticism of Eustratiades' edition.
- (15) These are:-
 Lug. gr. 49, letter 158=Lameere 201, Vat. gr. 1085, let. 184
 Lug. gr. 49, letter 196=Lameere 211, Vat. gr. 1085, let. 197
 Lug. gr. 49, letter 208=Lameere 214, Vat. gr. 1085, let. 227
 Lug. gr. 49, letter 209=Lameere 228, Vat. gr. 1085, let. 215
 (=Eustratiades Letter 187)
- (16) These are:-
 Eustratiades Letter 158, 3, pp. 116-118=Lameere 171
 Eustratiades Letters 187-189, 5, pp. 450-451. 489-490=Lameere 228, 235, 236.
- (17) Lameere 228=Eustratiades 187=Lug. gr. 49 letter 209=Vat. gr. 1085, letter 215.
- (18) Kugeas, op. cit., n. 14, p. 595, n. 3.
- (19) Lameere lists 242 letters (not counting the letter to Henry II of Lusignan) and five accessory documents which he assigns to the time of Gregory's abdication. Some of these have been placed arbitrarily such as nos. 241 and 242 which do not contain enough information to be fitted into the chronology. One important misplacement is the so-called 'Abdication Document A' (Mut. Cod. gr.

82 fols. 192rv and 193r). This dates not from the time of the Patriarch's abdication but is the document in which he suspends all clerics ordained by Bekkos (January, 1285). Laurent also has some misgivings as to where Lameere has placed certain documents. Cf. for instance *Régestes* n. 1505.

- (20) Of the two remaining letters, one is found earlier in the Vatican codex (Eustratiades 158, Lameere 171) and the other is missing from the codex but available in Mut. Cod. gr. 82, letter 193 (Lameere 208).
- (21) It should be noted that Lameere assigns no dates to the letters but only places them in a chronological sequence. For the Cheilas letters, cf. above, pages 110-111.
- (22) Eustratiades Letter 169, 5, pp. 215-216; *Régestes* 1543.
- (23) Lameere 201, ed. Kugeas op. cit. n. 14, p. 596.
- (24) Lameere 202, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 258rv, letter 193.
- (25) Lameere 203, Vat. gr. 1085, fols 258v and 259r, letter 195.
- (26) Lameere 204, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 259rv, letter 199.
- (27) Lameere 205, Vat. gr. 1085, fols, 264v and 265r, letter 226.
- (28) Lameere 206, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 259v, letter 200; fragments edited in Kugeas, op. cit. n. 14, p. 597.
- (29) Lameere.207, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 259r, letter 196.
- (30) Respectively Lameere 208, Mut. gr. 82, fol. 177rv, letter 193 and Lameere 215, Vat. gr. 1085 fol. 260v, letter 206.
- (31) Lameere 212, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 260r, letter 202.
- (32) Lameere 209, Vat. gr. 1085, fols. 259v and 260r, letter 201.
- (33) Lameere 210, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 257v, letter 191.
- (34) Lameere 214, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 260rv, letter 204.
- (35) Lameere 211, ed. Kugeas op. cit., n. 14, p. 597.
- (36) Lameere 219-222, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 261v, letters 209-211.

- (37) Lameere 217, 225, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 262r, letter 212; and fols. 260v and 261r, letter 207.
- (38) Gregoras I, p. 178; Pachymeres II, pp. 121-122.
- (39) For the library, cf. N.G. Wilson 'The Libraries of the Byzantine World', GRBS 8(1967), p. 63; for the scriptorium, cf. L. Politis 'Eine Schreiberschule in Klöster τῶν 'Οδυνῶν', BZ 50(1958), pp. 17-36.
- (40) Lameere 227, ed. Kugeas, op. cit. n. 14, p. 598.
- (41) Lameere 228, ed. Kugeas, op. cit. n. 14, pp. 598-600; ed. Eustratiades Letter 187, 5, pp. 450-451; Régestes 1547.
- (42) The scribe Melitas is also mentioned in Eustratiades Letter 182, 5, pp. 349-350 and Pachymeres II, pp. 385-388. He was supposedly attached to Gregory's school and was later made a deacon at St. Sophia when Gregory became Patriarch.
- (43) Lameere 229, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 263r, letter 216.
- (44) Respectively Lameere 230, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 263rv, letter 217; and Lameere 237, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 264r, letter 224.
- (45) Lameere 231, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 263v, letter 218.
- (46) Lameere 232, Vat. gr. 1085, fol. 263v, letter 219.
- (47) Lameere 235, 236; ed. Eustratiades, Letters 188 and 189, 5, pp. 489-490.
- (48) Lameere 238, Vat. gr. 1085, fols. 257v and 257r, letter 192.
- (49) Lameere 239, Vat. gr. 1085, fols. 264rv, letter 225.
- (50) For the reasons for his self-exile, cf. Pachymeres II, p. 123 and above, 109-110.
- (51) For instance, H. Ahrweiler 'L'histoire et la géographie de la région de Smyrne entre les deux occupations turques', Travaux et Mémoires 1 (Paris, 1965), p. 91, n. 123, does not even mention the existence of the monastery on Mt. Latros.

- (52) N. Choumnos Letters 76, 77, Anecdota Nova, ed. J.F. Boissonade (Paris, 1844), pp. 91, 93; M. Planoudes, Epistulae, ed. M. Treu (Breslau, 1890), esp. letter 68, p. 245.
- (53) M. Planoudes, Epigrams, MPG 147, c. 1175.
- (54) Pachymeres II, p. 230.
- (55) This can be seen by comparing chapters two and three of this thesis with chapter four.
- (56) The activities of Planoudes in the capital during the 1280's can also be used as proof of the continuing classical revival but these are not very well documented compared to his activities after 1290.

VII. The Legacy of Gregory of Cyprus

Because the greatest notoriety of Gregory's life belongs to the period of his patriarchate, his role as churchman and theologian overshadows the other interests to which he devoted himself. Although his contributions to the life of the Church and theology were his most important, his other interests and roles should not be forgotten. The diverse roles of churchman, theologian, belletrist, and teacher all belonged to Gregory and in each of these he demonstrated his genius. For the sake of clarity, it seems best first to examine his ecclesiastical and theological legacy and then to continue with his more 'secular' occupations.

The pathetic conclusion to Gregory's ecclesiastical career seems even sadder in light of his incessant work for the peace of the Church. Never having recovered from the taint of unionism, his attempts were always opposed by at least one of the ecclesiastical factions of late thirteenth century Byzantium. His competence as an administrator, attested to by his ability to continue working during periods of great pressure, and his brilliance as a theologian both remained unrecognised by his contemporaries. (1) As will be seen below, the passage of time has somewhat eroded the negative attitude towards Gregory of Cyprus but not fully. A recent passage spoke of him as 'a theologian of inferior talent who succeeded Bekkos as Patriarch'. (2) Misconceptions such as this stem from the treatment the Patriarch received from his contemporaries which in turn brought a disastrous end to his career and gave him an infamous reputation.

The omission of Gregory's name from the patriarchal lists helped contribute greatly to the dilemma of his recognition as a faithful son of the Church. Like many other late thirteenth century Patriarchs, his name was omitted, along with those of Nikephoros II (1260-61),

Germanos III (1265-67), John XI Bekkos (1275-82), and John XII Kosmas (1294-1303). This expurgation occurred not as the result of heresy on Gregory's part but because of the reconciliation of the Arsenites with the official Church in 1310. (3) The successors of Arsenios were struck from the lists as usurpers. Even Pachymeres, the historian of Gregory's patriarchate mentions the fact that the prelate was declared Orthodox prior to his abdication. (4) John Cheilas, the bitter opponent of the Patriarch also states with vexation in his treatise on the Arsenite schism that Gregory was not condemned but esteemed Orthodox. (5) According to Cheilas, the decision on Gregory's fate resulted not from *oikonomia* but through the meddling of the Emperor and bishops.

The period from Gregory's death to the end of the Arsenite schism (when his removal from the patriarchal lists occurred) also witnessed the casting of other aspersions upon his memory. Gregory's successor, Athanasios I, makes reference to his predecessor as 'the impious George'. (6) Although a saintly man, he seems not to have grasped the true significance of Gregory's patriarchate. By using Gregory's 'lay' name, he also implied disavowal of his ecclesiastical career. Despite the fact that the reaction to Gregory's theological thought was on a higher plane than much of the squabbling that had taken place at late thirteenth century Constantinople, personality clashes also had their part. G. Metochites, Meliteniotes, and Bekkos continued to turn out polemic against Gregory's work from exile. (7) Often, their attitudes reveal as much disdain for Gregory's character as for his pneumatology.

According to Gregoras, two other opponents of Gregory, John Cheilas and Daniel of Kyzikos ended their days miserably in the capital. (8) Cheilas, because of his intransigence in 1289, lost his see and never regained it. Theoleptos, who had led the group which proclaimed Gregory Orthodox, consistently opposed Cheilas' reinstatement. (9)

Completely destitute, even the deposed prelate finally admitted to Gregory's Orthodoxy. (10) If Gregory's fate can be termed tragic, the exile and destitution of those who caused it imparts a sense of poetic justice.

It has been remarked that 'Byzantine religious life continued under the Palaiologoi just as it had before, without dissidences or new heresies but also without revolutionary innovations in Orthodox thought'. (11) Surely, in light of the late thirteenth century, this statement cannot be accepted. While the dissidences of the religious-political parties can be dismissed as theologically and culturally uncreative, the thought of Gregory of Cyprus cannot. His work was not revolutionary but it was innovative in that it called for a return 'ad mentem Patrum'. (12) The trend which Gregory initiated in the thirteenth century continued in the fourteenth with the work of Gregory Palamas (1296-1359). Palamas' creativity weathered the same difficulties and criticisms as Gregory's had. Rather than merely repeat patristic quotations, Palamas carefully read the Fathers as Gregory of Cyprus obviously had, enabling him to interpret them creatively. In returning to the spirit of the Fathers, Palamas may also have used the writings of Gregory of Cyprus. Although he never mentions the Patriarch by name, a link exists between their respective theological systems. (13)

As mentioned in chapter five, the response of Gregory of Cyprus to a text of St. Athanasios which speaks of the energy and resplendence of the Spirit as the gift of the Son leads to the distinction between essence and energy in Palamite thought. In expressing the immutable relationship between the Son and the Spirit, Palamas says 'The Holy Spirit belongs to Christ by essence and by energy because Christ is God, nevertheless according to essence and by energy, it belongs and proceeds'. (14) The proximity of the thought of the two Gregory's also created

a striking similarity between their opponents, although separated by a half century. It has been noted that those who disagreed with the expression 'eternal manifestation' during Gregory's patriarchate were the forerunners of two of Palamas' own opponents, Akindynos and Nikephoros Gregoras. (15)

Both men objected to the primary implication of 'eternal manifestation', denying that anything other than the hypostasis of the Spirit could be bestowed through the Son and this only in time. They rejected both the concept of energy and its eternal and uncreated character. (16) The legacy of Gregory of Cyprus created a stumbling block for the adversaries of Palamas. Because his name had disappeared from the patriarchal lists, they could cast doubt upon his reputation. Conversely, the fact that the tomos of 1285 remained an Orthodox statement of faith cast suspicion upon their own polemics. Akindynos, aware of the problems this created, produced his own version of Gregory's patriarchate:

'The Cypriot who had become Patriarch of the Ecumenical Church, having accepted, I do not know why, in his treatise against the Latins the doctrine, according to which our Lord, by breathing upon the Apostles granted them an eternal manifestation, different from the Spirit itself, Creator of all things, was removed from his high position and deposed (sic!) by the wise and great Emperor and by the synod of that time'. (17)

'If he had said that the most divine Spirit itself was given to the Apostles... or that a grace different from the divine Spirit itself, neither eternal nor uncreated, was in question... he would not have spoken in favour of the Latins, nor contradicted our dogmas. It would have been right for this dogma to be condemned by the synod so that both it and its author should

be publicly exposed. But they were content simply with the deposition (sic!) of the man to blame, thinking that the dogma could be left to condemn itself by its own absurdity'. (18)

Interest in Gregory of Cyprus during the Palamite controversies consisted of more than the negative (and unfair) picture painted by Akindynos, however. The supporters of Palamas seem better aware of the debt owed to the Patriarch by their leader than Palamas' own work would lead us to believe. Both the Palamite Patriarch of Constantinople Philotheos and the monk-theologian Joseph Kalothetos praises the memory of Gregory of Cyprus. In a work written against Gregoras, Philotheos gives high marks to his predecessor's contribution:-

'I declare Gregory of Cyprus, a shining adherent, initiate and mystagogue of the true and foremost wisdom with a great fame of dogmatic teachings in all the Church and I say this because of his works, illustrious life, noble career and those many good struggles which by true faith he endured, struggling with the intellects of the Latins. .. the wise Gregory, teaching through his writings concepts concerning the Divinity, divine energy, holy illumination and its reception, has shown his harmony with the ancient Fathers and theologians'. (19)

Obviously, the negative attitudes towards Gregory of Cyprus began to dissipate during the Palamite controversies. Even Joseph Kalothetos, a Palamite theologian who wrote a vita of Gregory's successor Athanasios I, could praise him. It should be remembered that Athanasios had called Gregory 'impious' in his letters yet in his Life of Athanasios, Kalothetos remembered Gregory's memory with gratitude. Referring to Gregory's rise to the patriarchal throne, he speaks of the Patriarch as a 'person of pure life and esteem for wisdom'. Nor did the fact that Gregory's name was no longer found on the patriarchal lists inhibit him from designating

him 'a bishop chosen of God'. Despite the trauma of his reign, Kalo-thetos also lauded the administrative ability of the deceased Patriarch by calling him 'a good governor'. (20)

If the attitude of posterity towards Gregory of Cyprus began to change in the fourteenth century, the fifteenth century saw a truly affirmative reaction to the Patriarch's work. The crisis which the Council of Florence generated at Byzantium in 1439 caused some to reflect once again on the theological contributions of Gregory and the Second Council of Blachernai. Despite the problematic aftermath of the Council of 1285, the presence of the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria at it and its later recognition by the other two Eastern Patriarchs gave the meeting almost ecumenical authority. (21) Because the same difficulties with Western theology that had arisen in 1285 were recurring at Florence, a discussion and reappraisal of Second Blachernai seemed in order to some. During the discussions at Florence the question of the similitude of $\epsilon\chi$ and $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta$ arose once again. The Bishop of Herakleia attacked this development, wanting to produce the synodal tomos against Bekkos and the Union of Lyons which Gregory had written. Not more than three or four at the council claimed to know anything about the tomos and the unionists succeeded in voting down the plan. (22)

Union was eventually enacted at Florence but through a most indirect method. Impasse in the theological debate brought calls for a different solution, a solution quite coincidental in light of a remark made by Gregory of Cyprus at the Council of 1285. During the discussion described by Pachymeres, Gregory says 'The sayings of the Holy Fathers are interrelated and in full agreement with one another since they originate in different ways from one and the same Spirit'. (23) At Florence, the desperate unionists among the Greeks urged a solution with a similar attitude: 'saints cannot err in faith and even though Latin

saints and Greek saints expressed their faith differently, substantially they were in agreement'. (24) Gregory's statement initiated debate; the Florentine statement ended it. He could never have subscribed to the easy solution at Florence; he was too patristically-oriented..

As the Union of Florence fell apart, thoughts once again turned to the Council of 1285. George Scholarios, under suspicion for having subscribed to the Union although he later became the leader of the anti-unionist party at Byzantium, drew comparisons between the Council of 1285 and that of Florence:-

'Observe how great is the difference between the Council of Florence and the one that met in Constantinople against Bekkos. The latter is in complete agreement with the faith of the ecumenical synods, both the eighth and the rest; the former is in disagreement with them all, both that one and the rest. At the latter the Pope of Alexandria was present and the other patriarchs agreed with and approved of the result as a sound and lawful decision; at the former there were indeed procurators of the Patriarchs but they were limited by their letters'. (25)

Again and again in Scholarios' writings, mention is made of the work of the Council of 1285. In his second treatise concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, he quotes the final section of Gregory's tomos at length. (26) In other places, he speaks of remaining 'faithful to the Council which condemned Bekkos'. (27) And again, concerning that Council, he says to those who would recognise the Roman Pope: 'I shall judge... such an action as the holy, great Synod of Constantinople did, the one, that is, that censured the Latin dogma and deposed those who held it, namely Bekkos and his followers'. (28) Finally, while listing those illustrious names which defended Orthodoxy and demonstrated their wisdom in doing so the name of the Patriarch Gregory is not forgotten. (29)

The fall of the Empire presented a new set of concerns for the Byzantine Church and interest in Gregory and the study of his thought disappeared from ecclesiastical life. Later, however, his legacy was revived through the efforts of Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem. In the late seventeenth century, the Patriarch established a press at Jassy, Moldavia, which became the most important printing house in the Orthodox world. (30) In the 'Tomos Agapes', a treatise against the Roman Church printed at Jassy, the Patriarch included the complete text of Gregory's work 'Concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit'. (31) Realising the merit of the text in expounding the Orthodox viewpoint, the Patriarch obviously felt the need to provide an 'editio princeps' of it.

Within a few decades, the 'editio princeps' of Gregory's tomos also appeared but this time in the West. (32) It almost seems that the rediscovery of the merit of Gregory of Cyprus in the East made the West aware of him as a polemical threat. As Western theologians examined his work and that of Bekkos, they naturally preferred the latter. Bekkos has received an extraordinary amount of attention from Western theologians while Gregory has received much hostility. (33) Initially greeted with mixed feelings at Byzantium, Gregory's theological work was eventually lauded there. In contrast, the West has continually attacked his thought and the ambiguity of his reputation continues into the present.

Gregory's theological notoriety should not obscure his other contributions to Byzantine culture. It has been said that his career has 'little to invite attention' apart from his patriarchate. (34) Actually, his non-ecclesiastical activities were greatly respected at Constantinople and widely recognised. Even in the fifteenth century, George Scholarios spoke of Gregory as not only a talented theologian

and philosopher but also as 'the foremost rhetor in that ancient style of the Attic rhetors.. mighty in letters and discourses'. (35)

As such, he held an important place in the revival of letters at Constantinople following its recapture from the Latins. Gregory combined the roles of scholar, belletrist, and teacher, causing new interest in the ancients.

The debate continues as to what exactly constitutes Byzantine 'humanism', especially during the Palaiologan period. Could Gregory have been both theologian and humanist? Throughout Byzantine history, the scholarly study of Greek language and literature had experienced revivals and declines. Following the Fourth Crusade and the Latin occupation, and especially intense revival of the Greek literary tradition occurred at Constantinople. Even as ecclesiastical revival took place, an interest in the pagan heritage of ancient Greece also grew. Perhaps the possession of both Orthodoxy and Hellenic culture helped give the Byzantines a necessary sense of identity and superiority after their degradation by the Latins. (36)

Roots of the Hellenic revival at late thirteenth-century Constantinople extended back to the Empire of Nicaea. Although Gregory of Cyprus gives a less than enthusiastic report of the cultural institutions he found at Nicaea, the work of Blemmydes, Akropolites and the Nicaean emperors laid modest foundations for the Palaiologan revival. (37) The uninterrupted academic tradition stretched back even further than Nicaea. Niketas Choniates, the learned Constantinopolitan emigré who spent his last years at Nicaea may have inspired Blemmydes who later studied under another displaced scholar, Demetrios Karykes. Blemmydes, in turn, taught Akropolites, who became the teacher of Gregory of Cyprus; despite political upheavals, education did continue. (38)

As the thirteenth century progressed, the curriculum underwent changes. A comparison between the course of Blemmydes, which used scriptural and hagiographical models, and that of Akropolites, fully 'pagan' in its character, demonstrates this. (39) The reassertion of the Hellenic heritage was growing. Gregory's mention of his 'Greekness' in his autobiography provides a clue to his own quest for an Hellenic education. (40) Faced with the foreign occupation of the Franks which threatened the very identity of the Cypriots through the imposition of alien institutions and customs, Hellenic education furnished a means of rediscovering and maintaining the bonds with one's heritage. In light of his natural ability for learning, Gregory's problems with Latin do surprise; perhaps his disdain for the Franks contributed to his difficulties for he seems never to have learned the language properly.

But when the opportunity arose for the Hellenic education which he coveted, Gregory concentrated upon rhetoric. His growth as a scholar saw him place almost exclusive emphasis upon a pure knowledge of Attic Greek. With this in mind, the problem of Gregory as humanist can be placed in better perspective. Excepting his involvement in the Union of Lyons and his position as protapostolarios, Gregory's career until his election as Patriarch is so totally 'secular' that it would be difficult not to think of him as a humanist. Upon examining his oeuvre, however, one comes to a different conclusion. If the term 'humanist' is taken to mean a person who has taken the writings of classical authors and constructed a system of values from them independent of Christianity, then Gregory cannot be numbered as one. There is precious little concerning profane philosophy and science in his writings. Again and again, it is only the attainment of a pure Attic style that concerns him. Gregory, like so many other Byzantines who concerned themselves with pagan letters, remained fully Orthodox. His later theological work confirms this.

With very few exceptions such as Pletho in the fifteenth century. Byzantine 'humanism, as in Gregory's case, means the careful imitation of the ancient rhetors in composition, the joy of collecting and copying manuscripts of the ancient authors and perhaps the polite discussion in learned circles of their views but little else. The 'humanism' of Byzantium was a compartmentalisation of ancient culture for a small educated élite. In the fully Christian environment of the Empire, the life of the Church prevailed and the so-called humanists of Byzantium, unlike those of the Italian Renaissance and later, adhered to it.(41) The dichotomy in the life of Gregory of Cyprus is more apparent than real; his nostalgia for antiquity was always present but so was his devotion to the Church. The study of antiquity was a vital necessity for him but still a means to an end and not an end in itself.

The last phase of Byzantine literature has been described as an essentially rhetorical movement.(42) Perhaps it would be better to describe it as merely a continuation of the Byzantine rhetorical tradition. Rhetoric had pervaded all forms of intellectual activity at Byzantium since the fourth century; statecraft, philosophy, and theology were imbued with it. As has already been noted above, epistolography had also come under its complete domination by the end of the middle Byzantine period. There was a belief in the old ideal of an unchanging written language at late thirteenth-century Byzantium which had been bequeathed from the early and middle Byzantine periods. Because of this ideal, Gregory of Cyprus had sought a good education. Through him and his successors, Palaiologan rhetoric, as in earlier times, continued as the 'tendency to archaism.'(43)

An importance had already been attached to the use of rhetoric in the service of the state by the earliest Byzantine Emperors. The paramount place of rhetoric in the imperial 'university' from its inception demonstrates this. Rhetoric served the very important function of the proclamation of the Byzantine imperial ideology and the political theology of the Emperor's person.⁽⁴⁴⁾ Philosophically, rhetoric attained an important metaphysical function in not only serving as a vehicle for the interpretation of reality but also in its role as a 'philosophy of words.'⁽⁴⁵⁾ This etymological aspect of rhetoric eventually triumphed at Byzantium and might explain why original philosophical speculation never took root there. In the realm of theology, rhetoric had also been an influence since the early Christian centuries. The capadocian Fathers had put their rhetorical skills to use in theological writings. From their example, rhetoric continued to serve as a vehicle for the expression of Christian dogma at Byzantium.

Early Byzantine rhetoric took as its classic Hellenistic models the manuals of Hermogenes and Hermagoras of Temnos which stressed rhythm and exaggeration in composition. (46) With the passage of time, the 'Atticising' attitudes of the Second Sophists who emphasised a return to Attic authors and the imitation of their style also began to permeate Byzantine rhetoric. (47) Anna Komnene, Michael Psellos, Eustathios of Thessaloniki, the Choniates brothers, John Tzetzes, Nikephoros Blemmydes, and George Akropolites, all nurtured this 'Atticism'. (48) Gregory of Cyprus continued this tradition with his particular interest in the Attic styles of Plato and Demosthenes. (49) He also drew upon the 'Atticisms' of Aelios Aristides, a Second Sophist who receives many references in his letters. (50) Gregory's area of interest even extended to Libanios, a fourth-century rhetorician who modelled his compositions after Demosthenes, and among the writings of the Church Fathers, he felt a special affinity for Gregory of Nazianzos. (51)

The foundations of Gregory's rhetorical skills are to be found in the various progymnasmata he composed. As has already been mentioned, many of these were written as examples for his own students to follow. Of the twenty-one progymnasmata edited by Eustratiades, 17 are μῦθοι (fables), the accepted rhetorical genre for beginning students. Three others (17, 18, 20) are διηγήματα (stories which take mythical, dramatic or historical persons as their subject) devoted to Plato, Iphigeneia, and Kandaules, and a fourth (19) takes the form of an ἡθοποιΐα of Aeneas at the death of Pandaros. (52) More involved than these are the μελέται (declamations) which Gregory wrote, two of which are constructed as replies to the declamations of Libanios. (53) Finally, the fifth form of the progymnasma which

Gregory used was the *χρεια* type which expounded upon a certain 'theme'. His *χρεια* concerns a Socratic situation which he places before the reader as a guide to be followed. (54)

While these progymnasmata aided the rhetorical students who would eventually enter the imperial service and use rhetoric as a tool for furthering the policies of the Byzantine state, two other rhetorical works of Gregory augmented traditional Byzantine 'statecraft' even further. These were the *enkomia* which he wrote to Michael VIII and Andronikos II, the two Emperors who reigned at Constantinople during his lifetime. (55) Imperial *enkomia* had their origins in fourth-century Byzantium and from their inception acted as a stabilising force for ruling regimes. Eusebios of Caesarea, Prokopios of Gaza, Michael Psellos, Theophylact of Ohrid, Eustathios of Thessaloniki, Niketas Choniates and many others wrote imperial *enkomia* throughout the Byzantine centuries. (56) The encomiastic tradition evidently continued at Nicaea during the period of the Empire-in-exile and reappeared at Constantinople following its recapture in four imperial *enkomia* of Manuel Holobolos. (57) These *enkomia* were the immediate forerunners of Gregory's two works. (58)

Both the 'Enkomion to the Emperor Michael Palaiologos, the New Constantine' and the 'Enkomion to Andronikos Palaiologos' are filled with a mixture of classical and biblical allusions. The author's rhetorical cleverness manifests itself in that he lauds two sovereigns whose policies were diametrically opposed. Michael is the new Constantine because he defeated the Latins and restored Constantinople to the Byzantines (although he promoted union with Rome). (59) Andronikos his son is also the new Constantine but because he has kept the Orthodox faith! (60) Furthermore, Michael was Andronikos' teacher and Andronikos in turn has become a philosopher king. (61) From such

contrasts, it can be seen that Gregory was able to defend the continuity of the Byzantine imperial ideal rhetorically if not factually.

Different from the imperial enkomia but still a part of the Byzantine encomiastic tradition were the enkomia dedicated to non-human entities: animals, plants, towns, and the like. Here, Gregory also made a contribution through his 'Enkomion to the Sea.' (62) Addressing the sea, he marvels in wonder at the expanse of its waters. Only one other type of encomiastic format was used by Gregory, that of the 'vita sancti.' While the five vitae which he wrote were obviously extensions of his 'secular' rhetorical interests, they foreshadow his use of rhetoric in his later theological works. Quite interested in hagiographical literature, Gregory corresponded with Constantine Akropolites, one of the most noted hagiographers of late Byzantium. (63) Lives of SS. Dionysios the Areopagite, euthymios of Madyta, Lazaros of Mt. Galesion, and Marina from Gregory's pen have survived. (64) His most extensive hagiographical work, however, is dedicated to his patron saint prior to his tonsure, the Great Martyr George. (65)

Of particular importance in Gregory's belletristic output is his autobiography. To date, the texts of very

few Byzantine autobiographies have come down to us, making Gregory's an especially important example of a rare form in Byzantine literature. Both Libanios and Gregory of Nazianzos wrote autobiographies in the early Byzantine period but the form does not reappear again until the mid-thirteenth century. It will be recalled that Gregory of Cyprus was greatly interested in the styles of Libanios and Gregory of Nazianzos and this interest could have inspired him to write his own autobiography as a 'mimesis' of theirs. Immediately prior to Gregory's Constantinopolitan career, however, Nikephoros Blemmydes had composed the first autobiography since the early period and it is this work more than any other which inspired the Patriarch. (66) Gregory's autobiography has been called 'the perfect counterpart to the work of Blemmydes' and it resembles Blemmydes' in several respects. (67) While Blemmydes entitled his work *περί τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν διήγησις μερικὴ*, Gregory imitated him with the title *Διηγήσεως μερικῆς λόγος τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν περιέχων*. More importantly, the tone of both works concerns the conflict between *βίος θεωρητικός* and *βίος πρακτικός*. (68) The ever-present dilemma of the scholar who prefers his study but finds himself deep in practical affairs colours both autobiographies. (69) Although much briefer than Blemmydes' work, Gregory's account offers a clear, unaffected view of late thirteenth-century Byzantium.

It must also be mentioned that an autobiography was written by Michael VIII Palaiologos between those of Blemmydes and the Patriarch but it possesses an entirely different character. (70) Almost entirely concerned with the political accomplishments of the Emperor, it concludes with a *typikon* designed for his own monastic foundation. Other biographies followed that of Gregory of Cyprus but most of these are found within the context of one of the authors' literary works. For instance, an autobiographical notice of Pachymeres surfaces in his *History* and another

by Joseph the Philosopher prefaces his Encyclopedia. (71a) In light of this, these are not the immediate heirs to Gregory's autobiographical presentation; this distinction belongs to an untitled work of Theodore Metochites which Hunger has named *'HΘιxός ἡ περὶ παιδείας*. (71b) Similar to Gregory's work in format, it also resembles the Patriarch's autobiography in substance: the conflict between the scholarly life and worldly involvement is placed before us again. After Metochites, only one other isolated instance of a 'true' autobiography occurs in the Palaiologan period, an untitled work of Demetrios Kydones. (71c) From the paucity of true autobiographies at late Byzantium, it is difficult to agree with J. Irmscher that a new awareness of 'world and man' had dawned at Byzantium through the autobiographical format. (71d) Gregory's autobiography and those few others which were written at late Byzantium demonstrate the revival of a form used in early Byzantine times but defunct for six hundred years. Rather than something 'new' these autobiographies perhaps demonstrate yet again the Byzantine love for the imitation of the past.

The rhetorical and grammatical skills which Gregory possessed were also put to use in his theological compositions. It is interesting to note that in his praise of Gregory of Cyprus as a rhetor, Nikephoros Choumnos mentions the Patriarch's theological contribution before discussing his rhetorical style. Comparing him to his namesake, Gregory of Nazianzos, he mentions the Patriarch's understanding of the loftiest mysteries of theology, especially those pertaining to the Holy Spirit. (71e) Choumnos realised the ways in which Gregory had made use of his rhetorical knowledge in the semantic problems which arose in the theological debates of the 1280's. Especially important here were the distinctions he had made with respect to Bekkos' argument favouring the similitude of prepositions. (71f) Through these distinctions, the inadmissibility of the filioque was proclaimed.

The revival of rhetorical studies at Constantinople involved the re-establishment of libraries as well as educational institutions; the one could not exist without the other. Because of the Fourth Crusade, many books were scattered or lost and the first decades of the reconstituted Empire's existence saw an attempt to recover them and build up libraries. We know that the imperial library had been re-established by 1276 for a collection of theology written in that year contains the note 'deposited in the imperial library' (ἐναπετέθη ἐν τῇ βασιλικῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ).

(72) Of course, it may have been only a vestige of its former size, but the imperial library probably always remained the largest at Constantinople. As for the libraries of the 'university' and patriarchal school under the early Palaiologoi, there is no information. During the later part of the thirteenth century, the Akataleptos possessed a library and the Orphanotropheion must have had one since Holobolos taught there.(72a) While we know the Chora had a library in the early fourteenth century, it still remains to be seen what condition it was in in the late thirteenth. Lists of the contents of some

monastic libraries have survived but these show few secular books; both Gregory of Cyprus and Planoudes probably had access to only a fraction of the books they needed. (72b)

Books were always scarce and very expensive at Byzantium. (72c) Just as many had done before him, Gregory copied books for his own use, an obvious way to save money. (72d) Identifying himself as the bibliophile par excellence, he was sometimes lucky enough to receive a book as a gift, as he did from Metropolitan Isaak of Ephesos. (72e) Sometimes old copies in poor condition were discovered. From his correspondence, we know that Gregory sent Methodios the monk a book by Demosthenes to be put in order. (72f) This may very well have been a discarded text he found. Books were lent out by their owners to trusted friends but it was often difficult to convince borrowers to return them. (72g) Two of Gregory's letters imply that a book exchange occurred between them. (72h) If the dispatch of books between various parties took as long as the sending of letters, some Byzantine bibliophiles waited quite a while before a text reached them. (72i)

Even if a student or scholar decided to copy a text to save money, there still remained the problem of finding parchment. For much of Byzantium's history, parchment was in short supply and there appears to have been no guild identified with its manufacture. (72j) Gregory writes of waiting for a volume of Demosthenes to be copied because of a lack of parchment until the spring slaughter of sheep. (72k) In another letter, he writes to John Phakrases, a paper seller (?), in the hope of obtaining some 'folios. (72l) In instances where a copyist was secured to do the work, the commissioner provided the parchment in advance. (72m) The presence of these copyists in late thirteenth-century Byzantium raises in turn the question of the existence of scriptoria in the capital.

Since Gregory commissioned at least one copyist (George Mamaras) in the late 1270's, that person must have lived somewhere in Constantinople. (72n) He does not seem to have been a monk so he probably did not do his transcriptions in a monastic scriptorium. Three groups of illuminated manuscripts were recently assigned to late thirteenth-century Constantinople thus giving substance to the possibility of a thriving monastic scriptorium there. (72o) For obvious reasons, the proximity of a library to a scriptorium was essential, and a copyist could only transcribe books in the possession of the library itself. Whether transcriptions at a scriptorium in late thirteenth century Constantinople were made for an outside clientele remains to be seen. (72p) The three groups of illuminated manuscripts mentioned above imply the foundation of an imperial scriptorium during the period, perhaps at the Hodegetria Monastery. Fifteen books have come down to us from its library, proving that the foundation possessed the most important prerequisite for a scriptorium. (72q) Evidence of its flourishing scriptorium in the first half of the fourteenth century has been produced; perhaps its foundation belongs to the late thirteenth century. (72r)

Gregory's quest for various books also reflected the desire for the most correct edition of a classical text. A list of early Palaiologan manuscripts shows that quite a number of classical editions were copied during the period. (73) Interested not only in content but in style, the rhetoricians of late thirteenth century Byzantium thought to gain from the most precise text. Under the Palaiologoi, the editing of new commentaries to accompany the revision of a text became usual. (73a) Although this did not become common until the very late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries with Planoudes, Moschopoulos and others, its roots lay in the acquisition of texts in which Gregory of Cyprus participated although his reasons were

more fully rhetorical. By studying the most precise texts of Plato, Demosthenes, Aristides and Libanios, a better rhetorical style could be developed.

The philological work which Gregory carried out was aided by the texts he ordered from various scribes. Not only did he have a scribe such as Mamaras working for him at Constantinople; he also ordered copying to be done and sent to him from as far away as Thessaloniki.(73b) His requests covered not only the works of classical authors but also commentaries on various classical masterpieces. For example, he wrote to the famous bibliophile Skutariotes, asking him to send Syrianos' scholia on Plato's 'Parmenides.'(73c) An interest in a commentary such as this verifies the close attention which Gregory paid to the texts he studied. In another letter, written to Constantine Akropolites, he mentions not having time to study the corrections made to a book of Aristides.(73d)

Gregory's classical scholarship strengthened and complemented his abilities as both a belletrist and a teacher. The remarks of N. Choumnos, Mark the monk, and N. Gregoras verify that his fame as an Atticist did not pass unnoticed in his own day.(73e) One of the principal errors made concerning Gregory's career stems from the fact that commentators have attributed to his work the beginnings of Cyprus' medieval literature.(73f) In no way can the literary works of the émigré Cypriot be considered a part of that insular culture; his output belongs to Constantinople alone.(73g)

The question that arises concerning Gregory's teaching is whether it continued the curriculum of Akropolites.(74) His approach to the curriculum appears more heavily rhetorical than that of Akropolites.(74a) Choumnos' discussion mentions rhetoric solely.(74b) Whether Gregory's course was complemented by others we do not know, but

his was certainly the most prominent at Constantinople. Its importance to those entering imperial service has been demonstrated by the high civil servants which Gregory instructed.

It may be that the innovations of Gregory in the progymnasmata which he assigned his students inspired Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos (1256-1317), a priest at St. Sophia and probably an instructor at the patriarchal school, to do likewise in the fourteenth century. (74c) Xanthopoulos' life provides a career comparable to Gregory's. Although a churchman whose greatest work was an ecclesiastical history, he composed 'pagan' rhetorical pieces. Like Gregory of Cyprus, he held Gregory of Nazianzos in the highest esteem as both theologian and master of rhetoric. (74d) Some of the progymnasmata Xanthopoulos composed take forms similar to those of Gregory. One of them paraphrases a fable of Aesop while another uses the *xpeía* format which also received Gregory's attention. (74e)

If Gregory influenced N.K. Xanthopoulos, a person who was never his student, then the influence that he had upon his own pupils was obviously even greater. They manifested a lasting personal legacy to their instructor although there still remains some confusion in producing a complete list of their names. That Nikephoros Choumnos, Manuel Neokaisarites, and Theodore Mouzalon were his pupils seems certain. Letters addressed to them by Gregory and sometime their own words attest to this. The name of Theodora Raoulaina could also be added to the list, although she never sat in Gregory's class-room. Their correspondence reveals a student-teacher relationship in the rhetorical instruction Gregory gave her. (74f)

Finally, Theodore Xanthopoulos, the brother of N.K. Xanthopoulos, also appears to have been under Gregory's tutelage. (75) Perhaps it was through his brother that N.K. Xanthopoulos learned of the progymnasmata of Gregory of Cyprus.

Some of the other students which scholars have assigned to Gregory's tutelage probably never studied under him. It has been assumed that both George Pachymeres (1242-1310) and Theodore Metochites (1270-1332) sat in Gregory's class. (76) Because of their nearness in age, it seems more probable that Pachymeres sat with Gregory as a student of Akropolites. (77) He must have known the Patriarch intimately; their possible attendance of school together, the historian's tenure as a deacon of St. Sophia during Gregory's patriarchate, and his visit (with N. Choumnos) with Gregory to deliver the conditions for the Patriarch's resignation support this. (78) Pachymeres' sympathetic account of Gregory's reign also reveals an acute understanding of the Patriarch's character. Despite these facts, none of them sustains the belief that Gregory taught Pachymeres.

The possibility of Theodore Metochites as a student of Gregory's is even more remote. If he sat in Gregory's class, he would have been much younger than his fellow classmates, barely able to compete with them despite his own precociousness. Gregory's tenure as instructor (1273-1283) suggests that students such as Choumnos had already attained adolescence upon their enrolment in his course. Because both Metochites and Gregory wrote enkomia to St. Marina, a rare subject in hagiographical literature, a link between them has been suggested. (79) This connection of itself is not enough to verify a student-teacher relationship.

Although it has not been suggested previously, an academic tie between Gregory and Maximos Planoudes (1255-1305) also seems unlikely. Because of Planoudes' interest in Latin, Holobolos seems a more plausible

choice at Constantinople. Unlike Gregory, who had problems with the language, the Rhetor had enough acquaintance with it to possibly teach it. (80) He might have instilled the interest in Planoudes which led to his many translations from Latin to Greek. Planoudes and Gregory must have known one another since both favoured Church union during the reign of Michael VIII, but their scholarly contacts remain a mystery. It has been proposed that Planoudes succeeded Gregory at the Akataleptos in the early 1280's. (81) Manuscript research has shown otherwise - from 1280 to at least 1283, Planoudes was not yet a monk-teacher but only a scribe. (82) Furthermore, his earliest school was located not at the Akataleptos but elsewhere. (83)

The list of Gregory's pupils that emerges after close examination of the possibilities remains disappointingly meagre. Surely there were others who studied under the Patriarch but whose names have not survived. With but one exception, the number seems barely enough to carry Gregory's memory and work into the fourteenth century but this one exception is the most important one. Nikephoros Choumnos (1250/55-1327) emerged as the most important student of Gregory of Cyprus. It has already been shown how he praised his teacher and defended his memory but Choumnos' own creativity was stamped with that of the Patriarch's and much of his work reflects this. (84)

Like his teacher, Choumnos was especially concerned with rhetoric and style. Inspired by Gregory's own enkomion to Andronikos II, he wrote one for the Emperor in a similar vein. (85) Both are marked by the rhetorical influence of Aelius Aristides and that by Choumnos bears resemblance to Gregory's at many points. (86) Gregory's imperial enkomia not only inspired Choumnos but gave impetus to this particular literary form at Constantinople. His work can be cited as the inspiration not only for his pupil's composition but for the later imperial enkomia. M. Planoudes,

N. Lampenos, Matthew of Ephesos, H. Gabras, Thomas Magistros, and N. Gregoras, all wrote enkomia to Andronikos II. (87) Other enkomia were also written later for all the emperors from Andronikos III to Constantine XI. (88) It can be seen from such a list that the encomiastic tradition continued until the very end of the Empire. Gregory's enkomia, produced in the early years of the reoccupation of Constantinople by the Byzantines, helped focus new attention upon the imperial ideal and served as models even when that ideal was no longer viable.

Imperial enkomia aside, it should be mentioned that Gregory's 'Enkomion to the Sea' also led to comparable attempts by Choumnos and others in writing enkomia devoted to non-human aspects of the world and nature. Choumnos wrote an enkomion to the city of Thessaloniki. T. Metochites did likewise for Constantinople and N. Gregoras penned a discourse to Herakleia, his birthplace. (89) Closer in feeling to Gregory's work than these because they deal with aspects of nature rather than cities are the enkomia to the sun and summer by Theodore Pediasimos and the enkomion to the almond tree by Nikephoros Gregoras, all written in the fourteenth century. (90) Once again, it can be seen that Gregory's work gave impetus to the continuation of the Constantinopolitan literary tradition. And if Choumnos only wrote two enkomia after the example of his instructor, he surely imitated him in the prodigious number of letters he wrote - 172 survive. (91)

Following his rhetorical studies with Gregory, Choumnos entered the imperial service where he put his diplomatic skills to use. His role in the resignation of Gregory from the patriarchate probably provided an opportunity to use those skills of persuasion which the Patriarch had taught him. (92) In 1293, he became involved in patriarchal affairs once again with the designation of John Kosmas as Patriarch. Because of the continuing factionalism in the Church, Choumnos had to present

the candidacy of Kosmas so that it would be acceptable to all. (93) He succeeded in this but his greatest diplomatic-rhetorical triumph was yet to come. Choumnos' solution of the Arsenite problem in 1310 presents itself as a veritable 'coup de théâtre'. He succeeded in ending a schism which had plagued Byzantium for a half century and had given his former teacher particular grief. The elusiveness of a solution had driven most of the Church to despair but Choumnos used his powers of compromise to draw up a document which appeased the Arsenites as well as the official Church. (94) His master would have been most proud of his achievement. In light of the many ecclesiastical problems Choumnos helped solve, it should be mentioned as an afterword that he wrote some theological works but nothing on the magnitude of Gregory of Cyprus. (95)

Before examining Choumnos' last and greatest demonstration of his teacher's influence, the possibility of Gregory's rhetorical influence on others should be cited. The Patriarch and Planoudes had a mutual friend in Theodora Raoulaina; the three of them may have discussed their respective rhetorical viewpoints together. (96) Because of the work of Gregory of Cyprus, the Aristeidean tradition was revived and continued at Byzantium. Choumnos certainly carried on the tradition due to Gregory's personal tutelage. Less directly, Theodore Metochites would later use and defend the style of Aristides as the proper mode of expression in the absolute monarchy of Byzantium. (97) Imitation of Aristides reached such a level in the mid-fourteenth century that two declamations of Thomas Magistros were long attributed to Aristides himself or a contemporary. (99) Gregory's interest in Gregory of Nazianzos was also continued by others in the fourteenth century. Once again, Theodore Metochites took a great interest in the fourth century theologian's style, especially that of his poetry. (100) It should also be noted that Nikephoros Gregoras created his own style with reference to Gregory of Nazianzos. (101)

About 1325, a quarrel erupted between Nikephoros Choumnos and Theodore Metochites over rhetorical style. Choumnos' position harkened back to the instruction of Gregory of Cyprus a half century earlier. In a series of pamphlets, he attacked Metochites as an unclear stylist.

(102) Using Plato's 'Phaedra' as Gregory had, Choumnos stressed, clarity, flowing style, and careful choice of words. (103) Gregory of Cyprus' compositions contained all of these merits but Metochites and those of similar inclination whom Choumnos criticised would not even realise it: '... They have not been able to comprehend, covet and imitate any of his (Gregory's) uncanny virtues, they are limited to gather from simple words which are neither appropriate nor noble and which do not correspond in the least to the matters at hand', according to Choumnos. (104)

In Choumnos' opinion, the obscure style of these 'new' (νέοι) and depraved (αποδαίμονες) rhetors could barely be read as Greek. They ignored the preferred models such as Plato, Demosthenes and Aristides yet pretended to be inspired by Demosthenes. (105) After more than a thousand years, the quarrel between the Second Sophists and the 'Asiatics' had been revived at Byzantium through the debate of Choumnos and Metochites. (106) This recherche contest of style establishes how far the 'archaising' principle of composition had progressed in learned circles.. Metochites' rebuttal of Choumnos emanated from the emphasis he put on the place of 'cleverness' (δαιμότης) in Demosthenic rhetoric. (107) For him, clarity alternated with obscurity revealed true rhetorical skill. (108)

Gregory of Cyprus in large measure revived the Byzantine rhetorical tradition under the Palaiologoi. Much that followed after him in this discipline was based upon the rediscoveries that he and his colleagues had made through their own persistence in the careful copying and studying of manuscripts. Because Metochites disagreed with Choumnos, this did not

mean that he had rejected the work of Gregory of Cyprus. If one examines the positions of Metochites and Choumnos carefully, their respective views appear to have more in common than their rhetoric might initially suggest. (109) If Metochites would not admit outright to the ideas of Choumnos, there were others in the fourteenth century who did. Almost identical rhetorical viewpoints were shared by; John Glykys, author of the treatise 'Concerning correction in the domain of syntax' (περί ὁρθότητος συντάξεως) and Joseph the Philosopher, the polymath devoted to both classical style and classical knowledge. Thus, the rhetorical ideals of Gregory of Cyprus were also carried into the fourteenth century by others. (110)

Standing at the focus of late thirteenth century Byzantine civilisation, Gregory of Cyprus was the most cultivated individual of his epoch. His personification of the double interest in classical and theological studies which had always existed at Byzantium confirms this. At the centre of a cultural milieu which was heavily literary in its emphasis, he made significant contributions to both profane and theological letters. His career coincides with the attempts of Byzantium to rediscover its cultural identity. Following the Latin occupation, this became a task of primary importance. Despite internal stress, especially the problem of the Arsenites who staunchly opposed theological speculation as well as classical education, new cultural roots were laid at Constantinople.

Re-establishment of secular and theological education was the first mark of the Palaiologan revival. As has been shown, Gregory was involved in both the inception of secular education at Constantinople after the Latin occupation and its continuation. Holobolos' involvement with the instruction of future clerics confirms the revival of theological studies but Gregory's part in this remains unclear. The re-establishment of both secular and theological education and Gregory's own concurrent

classical and theological interests leads to the question of tension between classical learning and the Church.

In the late thirteenth century, the general feeling of goodwill which accompanied the repossession of Constantinople seems to have created an atmosphere of tolerance at Byzantium although once again, the Arsenites provided the exception to this scene of tranquility. It has been suggested that opposition to their social disruptions and those caused by the Union of Lyons helped the classical-ecclesiastical conflict recede into the background. (111) Another recent view stresses a more liberal attitude by the Church. According to it, 'For the first time in Byzantine intellectual history even churchmen no longer regarded the legacy of antiquity as mere decoration and merely to be tolerated for possible use'. (112) While this opinion may be an oversimplification, there appears to be no ecclesiastical disapproval of scholars' carrying out their classical studies in the late thirteenth century. The 'pagan' approach by Akropolites, its continuation by Gregory of Cyprus, the classical interests of Raoulaina, and the research of Platonides occur without hindrance. Perhaps this tolerance was more reflective of the period prior to the ostracism of Platonism and neoplatonism in the late eleventh century but its reappearance at Constantinople augured well for cultural revival.

Recent research has actually suggested ecclesiastical tolerance of classical studies as customary at Byzantium. (113) Suppression of texts and scholarly inquiry was hardly usual. Once again, the events of the late eleventh century present an exception, for the intellectual freedom in which Gregory of Cyprus participated at late thirteenth-century Byzantium seems the rule rather than the exception. This liberty would produce interesting results in the fourteenth century - some scholars would once again look upon classical studies as the best prolegomenon to

a full understanding of Christian theology. (114) Nonetheless, the absolute dichotomy between the theological and the classical remained intact at Byzantium during Gregory's lifetime.

In spite of the abrupt metamorphosis in the Patriarch's careers and the almost exclusive attention which theology received in the 1280's, secular learning did not enter a moratorium during this period. Although the leader of the Attic literary movement was preoccupied with theological matters and the sources remain silent on almost all developments other than those ecclesiastical, the momentum of classical studies continued. The first and foremost demonstration of this is found in the letters which Gregory wrote to Theodora Raoulaina. Furthermore, as Patriarch, Gregory certainly did not restrict profane letters; the presence of an individual such as Planoudes in the capital verifies that the discipline continued outside the Patriarch's circle. (115) When the monastic milieu gained control of the Church at Gregory's resignation and Athanasios I came to the patriarchal throne, classical studies were still in evidence nor were they suppressed at this time by the usually suspicious monastic estate. This is verified by the fact that Theodora Raoulaina kept her classical library (which Gregory of Cyprus had no doubt used) in her own monastic foundation and by the continuing establishment of schools attached to monasteries which taught secular learning to lay pupils, that of Planoudes being the most noteworthy.

Since Gregory's academic career was largely literary in its concentration, the philosophical, scientific, and artistic views of the late thirteenth century have not been scrutinised here but a few general remarks on them will help emphasise the classical revival at Constantinople. Aristotelian thought was the predominant philosophy at Byzantium at this time, especially as the inspiration for the course of Akropolites, and this preference continued throughout most of the late thirteenth

century. (116) Gregory's own allusions to Aristotle stem primarily from Akropolites' instruction which must have made him fairly aware of peripatetic thought but he otherwise has little to say on the man as philosopher. (117) The chief pupil of the Patriarch, Nikephoros Choumnos, had an overriding interest in Aristotelian philosophy and this might be attributed to Gregory since he may have taught rhetoric in conjunction with philosophy as Akropolites had. Despite his peripatetic preference, Choumnos did not place Aristotle in opposition to Plato but selectively approved and refuted various aspects of their respective positions. (118) This attitude marked a change from the strictly Aristotelian view of late thirteenth-century Byzantium; with the arrival of the fourteenth century, Theodore Metochites also became selective with both philosophers although he preferred Plato. (119) Thus, the Platonic revival at Byzantium had roots in the last decades of the thirteenth century. Later, it would continue with Nikephoros Gregoras and culminate in the neo-paganism of Pletho in the fifteenth century.

Although we know that Gregory of Cyprus did not spurn the astronomical signs of the zodiac, his scientific views remain unknown. (120) Throughout Byzantine history, scientific study and speculation usually harkened back to the views of the ancients and the late thirteenth century was no exception. Gregory's description of the curriculum under Akropolites mentions the instruction of arithmetic after Nicomachos and Euclidean geometry but the Grand Logothete's approach may have been more philosophical than systematic. (121) The complaints of T. Metochites in the next century concerning the state of mathematics would help support such a view. According to him, the discipline had fallen into almost total abeyance. (122) Aristotelian physics was also a part of Akropolites' course, but this discipline, once again, had a more general meaning than it does today. (123) George Pachymeres' 'Quadrivium'

demonstrates that the situation may not have been as desperate as T. Metochites described it. In his work, the pupil of Akropolites made a sensible digest and analysis of Aristotle's scientific work and showed a familiarity with the thought of lesser known thinkers. (124) If much of this period's scientific thought seems nothing more than a rehash of the ancients, the efforts of the contemporaries of Gregory of Cyprus did prepare the way for the immense interest in mathematics and astronomy at fourteenth-century Byzantium.

The late thirteenth century also saw a rejuvenation in art at Constantinople which drew upon the classical revival. (125) Although little monumental art has survived from the metropolitan school of this period, other items such as icons and manuscripts testify to a new artistic style. (126) Restoration of various monasteries, a necessary task after the disruption of the Latin occupation also probably contributed to the revival in religious art. Two prime examples for the last decades of the century were Theodora Raoulaina's St. Andrew in Krisei and the Church of the Prodromos built at the Monastery of Constantine Lips by Theodora, the mother of Andronikos II. (127) Many more monastic restorations occurred circa 1300, including those of Nikephoros Choumnos and Theodore Metochites. (128) Unfortunately, Gregory of Cyprus has bequeathed no surviving artistic commission which would lead to his designation as a patron of the visual arts. While we know that he ordered copies of manuscripts for his own collection, whether any of these were illuminated remains unknown. (129) Patriarchs often commissioned illuminated lectionaries or collections of homilies but once again, there is no evidence that Gregory did so. (130) Whether he commissioned illuminated manuscripts or not, the Patriarch was always in close proximity to the scriptoria of the capital, especially during part of the final period of his patriarchate when he retired to the Hodegetria Monastery. (131)

It will be remembered that this foundation probably possessed a centre for the production of manuscripts and perhaps even illuminated manuscripts. (132)

This brief résumé of the educational, philosophical, scientific, and artistic aspects of the cultural milieu at late thirteenth-century Constantinople illustrates how the classical revival permeated intellectual thought and expression. Gregory so totally dominated the literary and theological aspects of the period that only a few remarks on these subjects will be made here. Obviously, the literary movement in Constantinople at this time sprang directly from the classical revival. Through the efforts of Gregory of Cyprus, the movement became the first fruit of the Palaiologan revival.

As for theology, the problems associated with the Union of Lyons and the pneumatological turmoil of the 1280's reasserted the primary place of theology at Constantinople and Gregory once again stood at the centre of this development. It also was the one intellectual activity which remained distinct from the classical revival, but which drew upon it for its literary expression. The intensity of the debates during Gregory's patriarchate revealed that the Byzantines had not lost their supreme interest in theological speculation. Despite the general interest, Gregory's creative genius stands in stark contrast to the prosaic and pedestrian views which his opponents offered. They voiced no solutions but merely repeated theological statements without an examination of their context. The greatness of Gregory of Cyprus lies in the fact that, despite the intrusion of the West which caused the disruption of ecclesiastical life in the East for many years, Byzantium could still produce a theologian of the first rank. It was Gregory who initiated the revival of productive theological thought under the Palaiologoi.

In examining the various manifestations of Constantinopolitan culture in the late thirteenth century, the aspect of 'putting the pieces back together' is always present. Perhaps it comes as a surprise that the most intelligent representative of the period restricted himself to only two areas of concentration. When comparing Gregory to a polymath of the fourteenth century such as Theodore Metochites, his outlook must appear more restricted. If not only the conditions of Gregory's early years but those of the Empire following its re-establishment at Constantinople are recalled, the reason becomes apparent. Gregory toiled in the thirteenth century, not the fourteenth. Helping to lay the foundations for the more substantial intellectual and cultural advances of the first half of the fourteenth century required the scholarship of rediscovery, the re-assemblage of libraries, and the general piecing together of a civilisation almost completely shattered. While Blemmydes had devoted himself to this during the Nicaean period, much remained to be done and it was only with the repossession of Constantinople that enough impetus could be gathered to go about the task. Once the momentum of cultural activity had been re-established at Constantinople, the appearance of the polymath was inevitable.

Considering the brief duration of the repossession of Constantinople itself and its institutions prior to the period of Gregory's greatest intellectual activity (1273-1290), the Patriarch's output should be judged quite remarkable. Since the city was once again the imperial capital, the external problems of the Empire were always apparent and troubled the population frequently. The recurrent threat of the West, made so real by the policies of Michael VIII which led to the Council of Lyons and its consequences, continually haunted the public. Shaken and unsure of their own cultural identity, the Byzantines could only view the West and its alien culture with alarm. The Hellenic revival which Gregory led

acted almost as a defense mechanism against the encroachment of Latin culture. Without his leadership, the impetus of that movement would probably have been less decisive. In the theological realm, the threatening nature of Latin theology was even more frightening but once again, Gregory of Cyprus dealt with the problem in a creative fashion. Even more extraordinary was the fact that he approached the Western viewpoint in an unprejudiced manner.

Despite the gulf which separated Byzantine East and Latin West in the late thirteenth century, the two cultures were experiencing parallel developments. (133) During this time, the West stood between two critical periods of intellectual development. The ideas and problems posed by the scholarly ferment of the twelfth century still challenged its thinkers but a new intellectual discontent was growing among them. What confronted Byzantium at Lyons was the scholastic system of Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), in complete control of Latin theology yet unable to satisfy the intellects of the West. Based on the Aristotelian method, Thomism underwent increasing attacks by its Western European opponents who preferred a Platonic basis for speculation. As the new Aristotelianism waned in the West, a similar phenomenon occurred in the East, with an increasing preference for Plato after a long period of Aristotelian dominance.

The Latin view of the double procession of the Holy Spirit which confronted Gregory of Cyprus was strengthened by the principle of the relations of opposition inherent in the Aristotelian method of Aquinas' thought. Unlike the thinkers of the West, Gregory did not revert to Platonic thought in the face of scholasticism but in traditional Byzantine fashion depended upon the Fathers for his answers. Both spheres of Christendom were thus facing the challenge of scholasticism in the late thirteenth century but through different methods: A

Platonic attack upon Aquinas' system was prevalent in the West while a Patristic attack by Gregory upon the theology of Bekkos with its Thomist implications was found in the East.

These reactions in both West and East also contributed to a revival of intense Christian spirituality in both cultures. The rejection of Aquinas' system in many quarters of the West caused a sharp dichotomy to appear between the concepts of reason and revelation. This, in turn, led to an emphasis, especially among the Franciscans, upon personal piety. In the East, the continuing tradition of an apophatic theology, re-emphasised by Gregory's Patristic approach without recourse to other methods, ushered in the hesychast movement. Although not a spiritual master, Gregory's theological thought contained elements which would be of supreme importance to hesychast spirituality. This, and the growing strength of the monastic estate in Byzantium at the end of the thirteenth century helped provide the impetus for the growth of the movement.

Although Byzantine interest in the West had its origins in the twelfth century, this interest grew dramatically in the late thirteenth century. Paradoxical as it may seem, this interest, although limited to intellectual circles, co-existed with the suspicions of the West held by the general public. Prior to the Fourth Crusade, the Byzantine attitude toward the West had been one of disdainful superiority; the Latin occupation had transformed this disdain into hatred. Once the capital had been repossessed by the Byzantines, the hatred remained, yet the continued presence of Latins in other parts of the Levant provided the possibility for constant contact with the West. Byzantine intellectuals, intrigued by an alien culture so close at hand and aware of its obvious challenge could not ignore it. Many of them, such as Planoudes and D. Kydones, learned to read and even to speak Latin so that they could satisfy their intellectual curiosity.

Despite the Hellenic revival at Constantinople which acted as insulation against the intrusion of Latin culture, the small group of intellectuals who dared to take the West seriously demonstrated the intellectual breadth of Palaiologan culture. Although they were not fully aware of all the cultural developments of the West, these scholars realised that ideas of importance were being developed there and the attraction of the West became ever stronger for them as time progressed. The response of Gregory of Cyprus to Latin theology in the late thirteenth century marked the beginning of this movement. Gregory's careful consideration of the Western pneumatological position was succeeded by a number of other attempts to discover the West: the translation of Latin works into Greek by Maximos Planoudes, the scholasticism and eventual conversion of Demetrios Kydones and his followers, and the attempts of Bessarion to amalgamate the cultural heritage of both East and West provide the most notable examples.

It might be argued that the pneumatology of Gregory of Cyprus manifested nothing more than another all-too-typical attempt at theological polemic against the West than theological compromise. Close examination of his position, however, shows a sincere effort to demonstrate the participation of the Son in the eternal life of the Spirit, paramount in importance to Latin pneumatology. Gregory's unionist career had probably inspired him to look for a better method of dialogue with the West and his position was far more creative than the scholastic repetitions of John Bekkos. Despite his unionist past, Gregory's pneumatological solution gave a fresh answer to the problem of the procession of the Holy Spirit, true to the Byzantine position yet containing elements which served as an invitation to the West to re-examine its own approach. Gregory's pneumatology can almost be termed an expression of goodwill toward the West but it has never received the opportunity to be recognised as such.

Ignored at the Council of Florence, it still remains as a solution or at least the first step to a solution of the pneumatological problem dividing the Eastern and Western Churches. Gregory sensed that that division was unfortunate but never received the opportunity to heal it; the results of his life and work still provide the means to do so.

Any attempt to isolate Gregory from the circumstances of his time and analyse his personality presents difficulties. Except for his autobiography, not much material surfaces in his letters and other writings to allow us to construct a trustworthy personal portrait of the Patriarch. Although his election to the patriarchate seems perplexing and unexpected in light of his unionist career, he was, according to Pachymeres, the type of candidate the Emperor wanted, 'one against whom nothing could be said'. Despite Gregory's past, his lay status and exemplary character made his candidacy acceptable. The pressures and pathos of his patriarchate also do not allow a clear picture of Gregory's personality, victim of circumstances that he was. In this instance, the key which aids in revealing the Patriarch's personality is his attempt to solve the pneumatological debate between East and West. His open-minded attitude suggests that he was a person of tolerance, a quality all too rare in medieval history. As such, he stands as a lonely and isolated figure against the complex and confused background of late thirteenth-century Byzantium. Unappreciated by many of his contemporaries, he manifested the best that that culture had to offer.

Notes - Chapter Seven

- (1) For example, cf. Pachymeres II, p. 122. Although he retired to the Hodegetria, the Patriarch continued his duties.
- (2) F. Dölger 'Byzantine Literature', CIMH 4, ii, p. 220.
- (3) J. Meyendorff Byzantine Theology (English ed., Oxford, 1975), p. 87.
- (4) Pachymeres II, p. 130.
- (5) J. Cheilas, 'On the Arsenite Schism', ed. J. Darrouzès, Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine (Paris, 1966), pp. 401-402.
- (6) A.M.M. Talbot, The Correspondence of Athanasios I (Washington, D.C. 1975), Letters : 2, p. 6; 115, p. 302.
- (7) J. Bekkos, 'Refutatio Libri Cyprii', MPG, cc. 863-926; G. Metochites Historia dogmatica II, pp. 179-227; C. Meliteniotes, A work against Gregory still unedited, Paris. gr. 1303, fols. 82v-143r. Bekkos died in exile, c. 1297, according to V. Laurent, 'La date de la mort de Jean Beccos', EO 25(1926), p. 319. He gives the same obit for C. Meliteniotes. G. Metochites eventually returned from exile and spent the final years of his life in Constantinople. Cf. Pachymeres II, p. 271.
- (8) Gregoras I, pp. 179-180.
- (9) Pachymeres II, pp. 298-299, 358.
- (10) J. Cheilas, op. cit., n. 5, p. 400.
- (11) A. Grabar 'The Artistic Climate in Byzantium During the Palaiologan Period', Kariye Djami 4, p. 6.
- (12) Cf. above, p. 140.
- (13) Cf. above, p. 149 especially.
- (14) G. Palamas 'Apodictic Treatise' II (Coisl. 100 fol. 44v, ed. Constantinople, 1627), p. 71, quoted in J. Meyendorff A Study of Gregory Palamas (London, 1964), p. 231. For appraisals of the relationship between the two Gregoryses, cf. J. Meyendorff, *idem.*, pp. 13-17 and

A. Radovic, 'Τὸ Μυστήριον τῆς Ἀγίας Τριάδος κατὰ τὸν Ἅγιον Γρηγόριον Παλαμά, Analecta Vlatadon 16 (Thessaloniki, 1973) pp. 174-176, and the Conclusion of this thesis.

- (15) J. Meyendorff, op. cit., n. 14, p. 15.
- (16) J. Meyendorff, op. cit., n. 14, pp. 15-16. For that of Gregoras cf. J. Meyendorff, op. cit., n. 14, pp. 95-96, 110-111, 188 and 203-204.
- (17) Akindynos, 'Against Palamas' V and VII, quoted in J. Meyendorff, op. cit., n. 14, p. 16 from Monac. gr. 223 fols. 229v and 355v.
- (18) Akindynos, 'Against Palamas', V, quoted by J. Meyendorff, op. cit. n. 14, p. 16 from Monac. gr. 223, fols. 229v-230v.
- (19) Philotheos, Contra Gregoram, MPG 151, c. 915CD.
- (20) J. Kalothetos 'Life of Athanasios I', Θρακικά 12(1940), p. 87.
- (21) G. Scholarios, Oeuvres complètes, ed. L. Petit (Paris, 1928-1936), 3, p. 89; D.M. Nicol, 'The Byzantine Reaction to Lyons, Byzantium: Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World (London, 1972), article 6, p. 146.
- (22) ed. V. Laurent, Les mémoires du grand ecclésiarque de l'église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos (Rome, 1971), pp. 442-444.
- (23) Pachymeres II, p. 93; Gregory of Cyprus, 'Apologia', MPG 142, c.256D.
- (24) Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (Oxford, 1974), pp. 518-19.
- (25) G. Scholarios, Oeuvres complètes, ed. L. Petit, (Paris, 1928-1936), 3, p. 96, quoted in J. Gill, Personalities of the Council of Florence and Other Essays (Oxford, 1964), p. 216. The limitation by letter of the patriarchal representatives refers to the fact that the Eastern patriarchs refused to be bound by the decisions of their representatives at the Council.
- (26) G. Scholarios, op. cit. n. 25, 2, pp. 424-426. Section of tomos quoted, MPG 142, cc. 244B-246B.
- (27) G. Scholarios, op. cit. n. 25, 3, p. 173; J. Gill op. cit. n. 25, p. 217.

- (28) G. Scholarios, op. cit., n. 25, 3, p. 167; J. Gill, op. cit., n. 25, pp. 217-218.
- (29) G. Scholarios, op. cit., n. 25, 3, p. 127.
- (30) Th. Papadopoulos, Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Dominion (Brussels, 1952) pp. 155-6.
- (31) Dositheos, Τόμος Ἀγάπης, (Jassy, 1672), p. 387. In addition to Dositheos, there was another Orthodox bishop who addressed himself to the pneumatological problem almost a century earlier. This was Maximos Margounios (1549-1602) of Crete. According to D.J. Geanakoplos, Byzantine East and Latin West (Oxford, 1966), p. 171, Margounios solved the filioque problem by distinguishing two processions - one eternal and one temporal. Geanakoplos has erred, however, in suggesting that this approach was similar to that of Gregory of Cyprus. The distinction between 'eternal procession' and 'eternal manifestation' is something much different. Hence, Margounios cannot be considered an heir to Gregory's pneumatology and is not included as a part of the Patriarch's 'legacy'.
- (32) A. Banduri, Imperium Orientale 2 (Paris, 1711), pp. 942-949.
- (33) In this context, cf. the remarks of A. Papadakis, 'Late Thirteenth Century Byzantine Theology and Gregory of Cyprus', Byzantine Fellowship Lectures 2 (Brookline, Mass., 1975), p. 62.
- (34) Ibid., p. 62.
- (35) From a memorandum of Scholarios, quoted in A.C. Demetrakopoulos, Ὁρθόδοξος Ἑλλάς (Leipzig, 1872), p. 64.
- (36) D.M. Nicol, 'The Byzantine Church and Hellenic Learning' Byzantium: Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World (London, 1972), article 12, p. 29.
- (37) Autobiography, MPG 142, cc. 24D-25C. For the Nicæan roots of the

- Palaiologan revival, cf. A. Tuilier, 'Recherches sur les origines de la Renaissance byzantine au xiii^e siècle', Bulletin de l'association G. Budé 3(1955), pp. 71-76; M.A. Andreeva, Ocherki po kul'ture visantijskago dvora v XIII veke, Travaux de la société royale des sciences de Bohême, Classe des Lettres, N.S. VIII, n. 3 (Prague, 1927), pp. 128-142; and more recently, Angold p. 178.
- (38) I. Ševčenko, 'Theodore Metochites, the Chora, and the Intellectual Trends of His Time', Kariye Djami 4, p. 19(=Art et Société, p. 15); J. Verpeaux, Nicéphore Choumnos, homme d'état et humaniste byzantin (Paris, 1959), p. 31.
- (39) Gregory of Cyprus, Autobiography, cc. 25C-28A.
- (40) Autobiography, c. 20A.
- (41) For an excellent discussion of Byzantine humanism, cf. J. Meyendorff 'Spiritual Trends in Byzantium in the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries', Kariye Djami 4, pp. 95-106; idem., 'Society and Culture in the Fourteenth Century', Actes du XIV^e Congrès International des Études Byzantines (Bucharest, 1974), pp. 111-124. For a comparison of Byzantine and Western humanism, cf. Verpeaux, op. cit., n. 38, pp. 193-201. Cf. also I. Ševčenko, op. cit. n. 38, p. 40, n. 166.
- (42) D.J. Geanakoplos Byzantium and the Renaissance: Greek Scholars in Venice (reprint: Hamden, Conn., 1973), p. 291.
- (43) E. Kriaras 'Diglossie des derniers siècles de Byzance: Naissance de la littérature néo-hellénique', Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies (Oxford, 1967), p. 290.

- (44) H. Hunger Die Hochsprachliche Profane Literatur der Byzantiner I (Munich, 1978), pp. 71-72.
- (45) For this and the struggle between rhetoric and philosophy, cf. Hunger, op. cit., n. 44, p. 66.
- (46) H. Hunger, op. cit., n. 44, pp. 66-67.
- (47) For an excellent explanation of the Atticist movement, cf. R. Browning Medieval and Modern Greek (London, 1969), pp. 49-55.
- (48) E. Kriaras, op. cit. n. 43, pp. 283-286.
- (49) N. Choumnos 'Pamphlet II', Anecdota Graeca 3, ed. J.F. Boissonade (Paris, 1831), pp. 369-370.
- References in pre-patriarchal letters to Plato: Eustratiades Letters 28, 35, 44, 58, 69; to Demosthenes idem., Letters 65, 100, 101.
- (50) Eustratiades Letters 26, 38, 62, 75. For Aristides and his influence, cf. A. Boulanger Aelius Aristide et la Sophistique dans la province d'Asie au IIe siècle de notre ère (Paris, 1923).
- (51) Cf. Gregory's three declamations in Libanios' style, two ed. R. Foerster, Libanius Onera, (Leipzig, 1902), 6, pp. 52-82, 7, pp. 142-179; op. cit., n. 49, p. 367 and another, ed. M. Schmidt, Georgii Cyprii Declamationes e codice Leidensi editae, part 2, pp. 11-17 (Jena, 1876) and part 3, pp. 3-8, (Jena, 1877) and the comparison of Gregory's style to that of Gregory of Nazianzos, W. Lameere, La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre (Brussels, 1937), p. 3.
- (52) Op. cit., n. 19 above and H. Hunger op. cit., n. 44, p. 96.
- (53) Cf. n. 51 above.
- (54) Gregory of Cyprus Chreia, MFG 142, cc. 417-421.
- (55) Laudatio Michaelis, MFG 142, cc. 346-386, Laudatio Andronici, MFG 142, cc. 386-418.

- (56) Cf. H. Hunger, op. cit., n. 44, pp. 120-129 for an exhaustive list.
- (57) H. Hunger, op. cit., n. 44, p. 129.
- (58) For the enkomia of Holobolos to Michael VIII, cf. three, ed. M. Treu, *Manuelis Holoboli Orationes* (Potsdam, 1906), pp. 30-50 and (1907) pp. 51-77, 78-98, and the fourth ed. L. Previaie, *BZ* 42 (1943-49), pp. 15-45.
- (59) Recapture of Constantinople and its aftermath, *Laudatio Michaelis*, *MPG* 142, cc. 376C-377D.
- (60) *Laudatio Andronici*, *MPG* 142, c. 409BC.
- (61) Op. cit. n. 60, cc. 397CD, 412-414C. Angold p. 45 mentions the emphasis placed upon the concept of the philosopher king at Nicæa. Both Blemmydes and Akropolites held these views and Gregory continued them. Cf. also Barker pp. 151-161.
- (62) Enkomion Maris, *MPG* 142, cc. 433-444. For other subjects in enkomia of this type, cf. H. Hunger, op. cit. n. 44, p. 132.
- (63) Cf. Eustratiades Letter 2, 1, pp. 409-410, where Gregory submits a canon honoring St. Christopher to C. Akropolites. Other letters to C. Akropolites - 38, 39, 169. On Akropolites, see Beck pp. 698-699 and D.M. Nicol 'Constantine Akropolites, A Prosopographical Note', *DOP* 19(1965), pp. 249-256.
- (64) 'Enkomion to Dionysios the Areopagite', *Εὐαγγελικὴ Κάλλιψη* pp. 356-370. In Eustratiades Letter 111, Gregory complains to George Akropolites of the ignorance concerning St. Dionysios; he probably wrote the enkomion in the hope of eradicating that ignorance. Cf. also the article by I. Sykoutres, *EF* 23(1924), pp. 418-424. 'Enkomion to St. Euthymios', *Δελτίον Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας*, (1894), pp. 387-422; cf. also G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica* 1 (Berlin, 1958), p. 292.

- 'Enkomion to St. Lazaros of Mt. Galesion', AASS Nov. 3: 588-606; 'Enkomion to St. Marina', Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς 18 (1935), pp. 189-200, 227-239.
- (65) Laudatio Sancti Georgii, MPG 142, cc. 299-346.
- (66) N. Blemmydes, Curriculum Vitae et Carmina, ed. A. Heisenberg (Leipzig, 1896).
- (67) Quotation from J. Irmscher, 'Autobiographien in der byzantinischen Literatur', Studia Byzantina 2 (Berlin, 1975), p. 5.
- (68) H. Hunger, Die Hochsprachliche Profane Literatur der Byzantiner I (Munich, 1978), pp. 166, 169.
- (69) Blemmydes, *passim*. Autobiography, c. 28C.
- (70) Ed., with French translation, H. Gregoire, B 29-30 (1959-60) pp. 447-476.
- (71a) G. Pachymeres, MPG 144, c. 335. Joseph the Philosopher. cf. M. Treu, BZ 8 (1899), p. 34.
- (71b) H. Hunger, *op. cit.* n. 68, p. 168, citing Cod. Vindob. Phil. Gr. 95, ff. 189r-233v.
- (71c) D. Kydones, Apologia pro vita sua, ed. G. Mercati, Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota et d'altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della litteratura bizantina del secolo XIV, (Vatican, 1931), pp. 359-403.
- (71d) J. Irmscher, *op. cit.* n. 67, pp. 7-8.
- (71e) N. Choumnos, Pamphlet II, Anecdota Graeca 3, ed. J.F. Boissonade (Paris, 1829), pp. 367-368.
- (71f) Apologia, MPG 142, cc. 257A-258B, and cf. above pp. 139-140.

- (72) N.G. Wilson 'The Libraries of the Byzantine World' GRBS 8(1967), p. 57. The text in Parisinus graecus 1115.
- (72a) See above, p. 52.
- (72b) Maximi monachi Planudis Epistulae, ed. M. Treu (Breslau, 1890), Letter 67; N.G. Wilson op. cit. n. 72, p. 64.
- (72c) R. Browning, 'Byzantinischen Schulen und Schulmeister', Das Altertum 9(1963), p. 114.
- (72d) Autobiography c. 29B.
- (72e) Eustratiades Letter 1, 1, p. 415.
- (72f) Eustratiades Letters 100-101, 3, pp. 33-34; Sykoutres 5, p. 118.
- (72g) Eustratiades Letters 20-21, 1, pp. 422-424.
- (72h) Eustratiades Letters 30, 1, p. 429 and 58, 2, p. 203.
- (72i) Eustratiades Letter 85, 3, p. 21.
- (72j) N.G. Wilson 'Books and Readers at Byzantium', Byzantine Books and Bookmen (Washington D.C., 1975), p. 1.
- (72k) Eustratiades Letter 187, 5, p. 451.
- (72l) Eustratiades Letter 102, 3, p. 34.
- (72m) Eustratiades Letter 78, 3, p. 16.
- (72n) op. cit. n. 72m.
- (72o) H. Belting 'Die Auftraggeber der spätbyzantinischen Bildhandschrift' Art et Société, pp. 166-167.
- (72p) J. Irigoin 'Centres de Copie et Bibliothèques' Byzantine Books and Bookmen (Washington D.C., 1975), p. 23, demonstrates how the monastic copyists of Petra took outside orders in the twelfth century.
- (72q) N.G. Wilson 'The Libraries of the Byzantine World', GRBS 8(1967), p. 63.
- (72r) Cf. especially L. Politis 'Eine Schreiberschule in Klöster τῶν Ὁδηγῶν' BZ 51(1958), pp. 17-36.
- (73) H. Hunger 'Von Wissenschaft und Kunst der frühen Palaiologenzeit' JÖBG 8(1959), pp. 124-125.
- (73a) J. Irigoin 'Centres de Copie et Bibliothèques', Byzantine Books and Bookmen (Washington D.C., 1975), pp. 26-27.

Letter 57, 2, pp. 202-203. For Mouzalon, cf. Letter 118, 3, pp. 285-286 where Gregory is addressed as 'my teacher.' For Raoulaina, cf chapter six above.

- (75) N. Choumnos, Letter 3, Anecdota Nova (Paris, 1844), pp. 4-5. For T. Xanthopoulos, cf. R. Guiland, Correspondance de Nicéphore Grégoras, p. 386. He corresponded with Planoudes (ed. Treu, n. 28, cf. p. 217) and Michael Gabras (ed. Fatouros, 1, p. 64).
- (76) I. Ševčenko erroneously assigns both to Gregory's tutelage. In 'Theodore Metochites, the Chora, and the Intellectual Trends of His Time', Kariye Djami 4, p. 19, n. 3, he calls Pachymeres 'Gregory's pupil'. He also suggests in his Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos (Brussels, 1962) p. 41, n. 4, the possibility of the young Metochites as Gregory's student. R. Guiland, Essai sur Nicéphore Grégoras (Paris, 1926) p. 217, also mentions Pachymeres as a student of Gregory.
- (77) V. Laurent 'Le Quadrivium et la formation intellectuelle sous les Paléologues', in P. Tannery, Quadrivium de Georges Pachymère, Studi e Testi 94, (Vatican, 1940), p. XXVII. L. Brehier, 'Notes sur l'histoire de l'enseignement supérieur à Constantinople', B 3(1926), p. 78, suggests Pachymeres as a pupil of Blemmydes. It could be argued that since Pachymeres was destined for an ecclesiastical career, he would have attended the patriarchal school. Both the shortage of instructors in the capital and his Quadrivium cast doubt upon this.
- (78) Pachymeres II, p. 126.
- (79) I. Ševčenko, Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos (Brussels, 1962), p. 41. He cites T. Metochites 'Enkomion to St. Marina' in Logos 2, Vind. Phil. Gr. 95. Gregory's

enkomion to the same saint is in Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς, 4(1935), pp. 189-200, 227-239.

- (80) S. Runciman, The last Byzantine Renaissance (Cambridge, 1970), p.60.
- (81) V. Laurent, op. cit., n. 77, p. XIV, n. 5.
- (82) C. Wendel, 'Planudea', BZ 40(1940), p. 421.
- (83) Maximi monachi Planudis Epistulae, ed. M. Trou (Breslau, 1890), Letter 67; C. Wendel, op. cit., n. 82, pp. 407-410.
- (84) The definitive study of Choumnos is J. Verpeaux, Nicéphore Choumnos, homme d'état et humaniste byzantin (Paris, 1959)
- (85) Gregory of Cyprus, Laudatio Andronici, MPG 142, cc. 386-417. (=Anecdota Graeca 1, pp. 359-93). Nikephoros Choumnos, idem., Anecdota Graeca 2, ed. J. F. Boissonade (Paris, 1829), pp. 1-56.
- (86) J. Verpeaux, op. cit., n.84, p. 90, n. 4, suggests the following passages of similarity:-

| <u>Gregory</u> | <u>Choumnos</u> |
|---------------------------|------------------|
| Anecdota Graeca 1, p. 361 | 2, p. 4 middle |
| p. 361 | p. 7 middle |
| pp. 371-372 | p. 16 middle |
| p. 371 | p. 35 middle |
| pp. 385-386 | p. 48 beginning. |

Cf. also the remarks of M. Gedeon, Πατριαρχικοί Πίνακες (Constantinople, 1890).

- (87) Cf. H. Hunger, op. cit., n. 44, pp. 129-130 for the list.
- (88) Cf. H. Hunger, op. cit., n. 44, pp. 130-131 for the authors.
- (89) N. Choumnos, Περὶ δικάτοσύνης, ed. J.F. Boissonade, Anecdota Graeca, 2, (Paris, 1829), pp. 137-187. Cf. H. Hunger, op. cit., n. 44, pp. 172-174, for the other references. It must be mentioned that these works, unlike Gregory's, appear within the context of other literary works which might cause them to be classified as ekphraséis.

- (90) H. Hunger, op. cit., n. 44, p. 132.
- (91) J. Verpeaux, op. cit., n. 84, p. 63; N. Choumnos, Letters, ed. J.F. Boissonade, Anecdota Nova (Paris, 1844), pp. 1-190.
- (92) Pachymeres II, p. 126.
- (93) Pachymeres II, pp. 183-184.
- (94) Gregoras I, p. 262. For the text of the document, cf. V. Laurent, 'Les grandes crises religieuses à Byzance. La fin du schisme Arsénite', Académie Roumaine-Bulletin de la section historique 26(1945), pp. 297-302.
- (95) G. Sarton, Introduction to the History of Science 3 (Baltimore, 1948), p. 586, attributes a treatise against the Latin doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit to Choumnos but Verpeaux, op. cit., n. 84, records nothing concerning it.
- (96) Maximi monachi Planudi Epistulae, ed. M. Treu (Breslau, 1890), Letter 68, p. 245; N. Choumnos, Letters, ed. J.F. Boissonade, Anecdota Nova (Paris, 1844), Letters 76-77, pp. 91-93 also demonstrate that Choumnos could have been part of such a literary 'salon' if it ever met.
- (97) I. Ševčenko, 'Theodore Metochites, the Chora, and the Intellectual Trends of His Time', Kariye Djami 4, pp. 47-48, citing Logos 17, Vindobon. Ph. gr. 95; idem. op. cit., n. 79, pp. 169-170.
- (99) F. Linz, 'On the Authorship of the Liptinean Declamations Attributed to Aristeides', American Journal of Philology, 63(1942), pp. 154-158.
- (100) Op. cit. n. 97, p. 38, n. 149, citing Logos 6, Vindobon Ph. gr. 95 fols. 97r-145v among others.
- (101) E. Kriaras, 'Diglossie des derniers siècles de Byzance: Naissance de la littérature néo-hellénique', Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies (Oxford, 1967), p. 291.
- (102) N. Choumnos, 'Pamphlet I', pp. 356-364, 'Pamphlet II', pp. 365-391, Anecdota Graeca 3, ed. J.F. Boissonade (Paris, 1831). For a

complete discussion of the quarrel, cf. I. Ševčenko, op. cit.
n. 79, esp. pp. 22-59.

- (103) N. Choumnos, Pamphlet I, Anecdota Graeca 3, ed. J.F. Boissonade (Paris, 1829), p. 361; I. Ševčenko, op. cit., n. 79, pp. 22-59.
- (104) N. Choumnos, Pamphlet II, op. cit., n. 102, p. 368.
- (105) Ibid., pp. 369-374; I. Ševčenko, op. cit., n. 79, pp. 26, 28.
- (106) I. Ševčenko, op. cit., n. 79, p. 26; R.J.H. Jenkins, 'The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Literature', DOP 17(1963), p. 44.
- (107) I. Ševčenko, op. cit., n. 79, p. 53. For the concept, cf. L. Voit, Δεινότης - Ein antiker Stilbegriff (Leipzig, 1934).
- (108) I. Ševčenko, op. cit., n. 79, p. 58.
- (109) For their proximity, cf. esp. I. Ševčenko, op. cit., n. 79, p. 53.
- (110) E. Kriaras, op. cit., n. 101, p. 290; J. Verpeaux, op. cit. n. 84, p. 115.
- (111) J. Meyendorff, 'Spiritual Trends in Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Century Byzantium', Kariye Djami 4, p. 96. For a survey of ecclesiastical tolerance of classical studies during the later Byzantine period, cf. D.M. Nicol, 'The Byzantine Church and Hellenic Learning', Byzantium: Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World (London, 1972), article 12.
- (112) H.G. Beck 'Geistiges Leben in der byzantinischen Kirche des ausgehenden Mittelalters', Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, ed. H. Jedin (Freiburg, 1968), 3, ii, p. 608.
- (113) Cf. esp. N.G. Wilson, 'The Church and Classical Studies at Byzantium' Antike und Abendland 16 (1970), pp. 68-77.
- (114) Joseph the Philosopher became one of the chief advocates of this viewpoint. Cf. B. Tatakis, La philosophie byzantine (second ed., Paris, 1959), pp. 244-246. An abuse of this attitude would lead to the implication by Barlaam of Calabria that there was essentially no difference between profane philosophy and Christian revelation. Cf. J. Meyendorff, op. cit., n. 111, p. 100ff.

- (115) It is known that Planoudes was living in the capital at this time.
Cf. above n. 82.
- (116) Cf. above, p. 50.
- (117) Autobiography c. 25CD. Other references to Aristotle, Eustratiades Letter 44, 1, pp. 438-439; and Letter 47, 2, pp. 196-197.
- (118) N. Choumnios, Letter 8, Anecdota Nova, ed. J.F. Boissonade (Paris, 1844), pp. 11-12; B. Tatakis, op. cit. n. 114, p. 248.
- (119) T. Metochites, ed. Ch. Müller, Miscellanea (Leipzig, 1821, reprint Amsterdam, 1966), p. 169; B. Tatakis, op. cit. n. 114, pp. 250-251.
- (120) Eustratiades, Letter 34, 1, pp. 430-431.
- (121) Autobiography, c. 25CD.
- (122) C.N. Sathas, Μεσαιωνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη, 1, κε', f. (Venice 1872) pp. 139-95; K. Vogel, op. cit., n. 123, p. 276.
- (123) Cf. the excellent explanation of K. Vogel, 'Byzantine Science', CMH 4, ii (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 279-280.
- (124) Ed. P. Tannery, Quadrivium de Georges Pachymère, Studi e Testi 94 (Vatican, 1940); B. Tatakis, op. cit. n. 114, p. 239.
- (125) A. Grabar 'Artistic Climate in Byzantium During the Palaeologan Period', Kariye Djami 4, pp. 9-12; O. Demus, 'The Style of the Kariye Djami and its Place in the Development of Palaeologan Art', *idem.*, p. 111.
- (126) O. Demus, op. cit., n. 125, pp. 143-146. The mosaic icons of the Crucifixion at Berlin and that of the Forty Martyrs at Dumbarton Oaks belong to this period. Manuscripts ascribed to this period include Leningrad, Public Library gr. 101; Mt. Athos, Ivion 5; British Museum, Burney 20; and Par. gr. 54. With respect to these and other illuminated manuscripts, cf. also H. Belting 'Die Auftraggeber der spätbyzantinischen Bildhandschrift', Art et Société, pp. 149-176.

- (127) I. Ševčenko, op. cit., n. 97, p. 54, n. 247.
- (128) For a full list, cf. V. Laurent, 'Une fondation monastique de Nicéphore Choumnos', REB 12(1954), p. 32, nn. 1 and 2.
- (129) Cf. above, p. 186a.
- (130) Gregory's chief scholarly interests were rhetorical and rhetoric as a literary genre could sometimes inspire a painter to illustrate the narrative of a composition, especially in the case of homilies. Cf. K. Weitzmann 'Cyclic Illustration in Byzantine Manuscripts', Byzantine Books and Bookmen (Washington, D.C., 1975), p. 108.
- (131) Gregoras I, p. 178; Pachymeres II, pp. 121-122.
- (132) L. Politis 'Eine Schreiberschule in Klöster τῶν Ὁδηγῶν BZ 51(1958), pp. 17-36.
- (133) Cf. the remarks of J. Meyendorff, op. cit. n. 14, p. 25.

Conclusion

Gregory's Theology : Its Method and Place in Byzantine Thought

The theology of Gregory of Cyprus surfaced amidst the unedifying currents of disagreement which consumed late thirteenth-century Byzantium. Much as one would like to isolate it from these events in order to obtain a clearer picture of the Patriarch's thought, it eventually becomes clear that Gregory's theology can only be understood and judged with reference to the historical circumstances and the cultural milieu of early Palaiologan Constantinople. All important theological decisions in the Byzantine Church's history resulted from the need for clarification in the face of pressing situations and Gregory's solutions were no different in this respect.

Since late thirteenth-century Byzantium can be termed a literary culture from an examination of the life, times, and writings of Gregory of Cyprus, a brief exploration of the components of Byzantine literature can aid in understanding how the Patriarch made his own contribution to Byzantine theology, through his application of traditional 'forms'. The theological 'system' which he developed in response to the pneumatological controversies of his Patriarchate marked not only the reinstitution of creative theological speculation at Byzantium, but also the fresh beginning of theological writing as an important part of Byzantine literature.

The most important component of Byzantine literature was the word itself. While this may sound over simplistic and obvious, the correct choice of words was approached almost reverentially by the Byzantines. (1) They took a great interest in etymology since it was believed that the name of an object expressed its real nature and that it was also connected with the object's essence. (2) Once the correct words had been chosen, it remained to put them in their best arrangement and it was

through rhetoric that this was accomplished. Although the classical roots of medieval Greek rhetoric have already been traced above, it still remains to stress the fact that Byzantine rhetoric differed dramatically from its classical counterpart in its presentation. Rhetoric, by its very nature according to the Graeco-Roman tradition, was presented orally; at Byzantium it was written. Because the word was important and had to be recorded, rhetoric was largely confined to the written page, no longer declaimed by an orator but merely read aloud by a reader.

The transformation of rhetoric from an oral into a written art ushered in the cult of the book at Byzantium. During Hellenistic times, the desire of individuals to possess books began to grow and the acquisition of them later at Byzantium became synonymous with the life of the literateur. Respect for the spoken word passed to the rhetorical works inscribed within books. As a result, books became one of the most precious marks of Byzantine culture. They manifested the close tie between the literary and visual arts which emanated from Byzantine 'aesthetics'. Of course, the Byzantines had no conception of a special discipline called 'aesthetics' since such a concept did not originate until the eighteenth century. While there was no *aesthetics* per se at Byzantium, there was nothing in the Byzantine thought world which was *unaesthetic*. Everything was viewed holistically; God's entire creation had a beauty which consisted of size and order. (3) Beauty was perceived by 'aisthesis', the power of sensual perception. Neither analytic nor discursive reasoning caused it, for it was 'apprehended by a sudden vision'. Plotinus had made this idea a part of his neo-Platonic philosophy and both Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzos had reflected upon the concept in a Christian context. (4)

Since creation seemed so well-ordered to the Byzantines, they had a mathematical approach to its beauty. In the world of matter, gestures,

materials, sounds, and words could be used to reflect not only the symmetry, but the rhythm and balanced movements of creation. In Byzantine rhetoric, there is a constant emphasis upon the rhythm and arrangement of words. (5) The rhythm of a well thought-out rhetorical piece encapsulated within a text, the vision of a well-ordered cosmos.

Gregory of Cyprus' solution to the problem of the Procession of the Holy Spirit reveals a rhetorician as theologian in a late Byzantine context. What follows below is a suggested approach to his theological method in light of his rhetorical interests. In arriving at his answer, Gregory depended upon the employment of certain words whose definitions had been crystallised in the Byzantine mind by past Patristic usage. Through the context of his remarks, he gave another dimension to these words. Because of this, his opponents denounced him. (6) Their attitude reflected how rigid Byzantium had become towards the creative usage of words. Since the Byzantines placed a heavy emphasis on words in isolation, they often approached a text with preconceived ideas of what it should mean when certain traditional words were used in it. When they read these words in the context of Gregory's remarks, they were so scandalised that they refused to consider his position and would only consider the words he employed in isolation. Hence, the battle of words which ensued originated as much from a literary attitude as a theological one.

While the compartmentalisation of classical studies at Byzantium has already been stressed above, it must also be realised that rhetoric could aid as a tool in the presentation of theological material. While theology remained distinct from the classical revival at late thirteenth-century Byzantium, Gregory of Cyprus drew upon it for the literary expression of his theological system. His study of antique style enabled him to use rhetoric as the vehicle for the presentation of his theology. Classical form served the proclamation of Christian doctrine at late Byzantium

just as it had for the Cappadocian Fathers. (7)

In addition to the semantic problem caused by Gregory's use of time-honoured words in a new context, his return *'ad mentum Patrum'* owed much to the honoured place of the book in Byzantine culture. In this instance, it was the writings of the Fathers themselves. The attitudes of Bekkos and even the deliberations of the Council of 1285 revealed a flaw which had evolved in the Byzantine attitude toward written texts. Bekkos' acceptance of the filioque occurred through a book which consisted of nothing more than a selection of quotations from the Fathers. (8) When he and his supporters appeared before the Council of 1285, he once again depended upon a compendium to defend his position. (9) After Bekkos' condemnation, the Council examined the text of John of Damascus which had served as the foundation for the former Patriarch's defense. In doing so, they looked at the text in isolation without any recourse to the other writings of Damascus and additional Church Fathers which might clarify the text. As a result, they were confused by its seeming contradictions and turned to Gregory of Cyprus to remedy the situation with his *tomos*. (10)

These events during Gregory's patriarchate demonstrate that both words and texts were being examined in isolation at late thirteenth-century Byzantium. Books which contained the actual writings of authors in full were overlooked because of the popular compendia of quotations and texts which served the Byzantine love for collections of information but which often proved useless in the scholarly pursuit of intellectual advancement. (11) Such a fragmented approach could be of no use to Gregory, especially since he stressed that the views of the Fathers were interrelated and in full agreement. (12) His theological output confirms that he followed this holistic conception by carefully reading the relevant works of the Fathers which would help him solve the pneumato-

logical problem. His approach was not only theologically sound but also acted as a literary corrective to textual research at Byzantium.

Gregory's actual solution to the problem also succeeded because of the holistic approach which he adopted in his 'vision of God', an approach consonant with Byzantine aesthetics. Because of the completeness which he saw in the unity of God, he could not accept the 'filioque' since it caused imbalance in the Trinity. Thinking 'visually' in terms of harmony and proportion, inherent qualities of both creation and the Creator, and unable to depend upon analytic or discursive reasoning because of God's apophatic nature, his vision of God occurred metalogically. This was possible by relating the thought image of wholeness to the abstract idea of completeness. Thus, his vision of the Trinity paralleled that of Gregory of Nazianzos - conceiving the One, he suddenly discerned the splendor of the Three but in distinguishing Them, he returned to the One. He ensured balance within the Godhead by stressing that the Father stood in the relation of cause to the other two Persons. (13) The wholeness of the Godhead remained intact.

But Gregory had to go a step further and express the eternal relationship between the Son and the Spirit without implying that the Son was responsible for the Spirit's origin. His use of light as the medium of the Spirit's eternal manifestation further enhanced the visual character of his theology and helped assure that it remained true to both his holistic vision of the Godhead and to Byzantine aesthetics. Already, having used the 'eyes of the mind' to visualise the completeness of the Godhead, he also depended upon 'aisthesis' for an understanding of the Spirit's eternal manifestation. Because there had been a recurring association between light and life in Byzantine theology, it was natural for Gregory to use it too. In his theology, the Divine Life is shown through the Divine Light which is carried forth by the Holy Spirit and

imparted to man who receives it by sensual perception. This Divine Light reveals not the essence of God but his 'manifestation' or those qualities of the Godhead which are recognisable and therefore not identifiable with the essence. These qualities are not restricted to merely 'light' but Gregory has used radiance as the most obvious expression of 'manifestation' which comes from the Father, goes forth from the Godhead in the Holy Spirit but is expressed in the Son. (14)

Through the Son the 'manifestation' is carried by the Spirit since the Son shares in the essence of the Spirit eternally. By this formula, the eternal relationship between the Son and the Spirit is proclaimed. In the theology of Gregory of Cyprus, his complete rejection of a spatial scheme of the Trinity enhances the holistic vision. Using the concept of light, Gregory has actually transformed the metaphor of the sun and its rays so often used by the Fathers to explain the Trinity. In his thought, the rays from the Father-source are the Holy Spirit yet the Son is the boundless circumference of the Father within which the uncreated light of the Trinity is carried. No longer is there any separation, the light experienced belongs intimately to all Three Persons. (15)

In attaching an aesthetic significance to the theology of Gregory of Cyprus and his belief in the experiential nature of the Divine, the possible objection that his approach was actually neo-Platonic must be considered. Since 'aisthesis' plays an important role in his theological attitude, does not his ultimate vision parallel the view of Photius that the Divine (or rather the Beautiful) is experienced by the aisthesis of body and mind? While it is true that there are parallels here, there is a drastic difference in their viewpoints concerning the experience of the Divine Itself. In Plotinus, to achieve the Divine is no longer to be external to it but to be part of it, losing one's identity. (16)

In Gregory of Cyprus, the Divine is experienced but the individual remains intact, participating in the manifestation but not in the essence where one's identity would surely be lost. (17)

While it has been stressed above that Gregory's theology represents a defense against the scholasticism of Aquinas, it would be wrong to think of it as a methodological attack upon scholasticism. (18)

Gregory had certainly never read any Aquinas and neither had Bekkos.

The principle of the relations of opposition could easily be attached to Bekkos' pneumatology, however, so Gregory's attitude does have value as an approach completely different from the scholastic method which could be easily applied to verify his opponent's viewpoint. Relations of opposition allowed Two Persons of the Trinity (the Father and Son) to become a non-personal dyad opposed to the Third Person (the Holy Spirit). Thus, the filioque could be proclaimed since the Spirit received origin from both the Father and Son. (19) This approach destroyed the balance between the essence and the Persons and fragmented the wholeness of the Godhead.

In contrast, Gregory viewed God as identically a monad and a triad as had Gregory of Nazianzos and Maximos the Confessor. (20) As Lossky has explained, if God is identically monad and triad, He cannot be a monad alone and not a dyad for a dyad is an opposition of two terms. (21) Thus the Father and the Son cannot be the source of origin for the Spirit but the Father only. Gregory's holistic vision showed that his thinking was very different from a method which could allow imbalance in the Trinity. Relating the thought image of wholeness to the abstract idea of completeness, he viewed the Trinity metalogically, envisioning completeness in the absolute diversity expressed in the formulae $3 = 1$ and $1 = 3$. In contrast, the scholastic method caused a fragmentation within the Godhead by its 'logical' opposition of terms - the first to the

and those two to the third. There could be neither absolute diversity nor completeness in this imbalance.

All this could be carried even a step further by applying these attitudes toward ultimate reality as attitudes toward reality itself. It could be argued that these two very different 'solutions' to the principal intellectual problem of the Middle Ages have affected Eastern and Western thought up to the present. Gregory's position not only asserts the holistic approach of Byzantine theology and aesthetics but demonstrates that the rationalism which developed from Aquinas' method was rather alien to Byzantine thinking. Gregory's theology never really departs from its experiential aspect of 'aisthesis'; Aquinas' in contrast, depends on 'noesis' (and this could be narrowed even to the 'dianoia'). While it is true that Aquinas' scholasticism waned in the West at the end of the thirteenth century, it eventually regained its strength and led the West to the rationalism of the Enlightenment and the complete dichotomy between reason and revelation. Such a dichotomy would seem to be impossible at Byzantium in light of Gregory of Cyprus' approach, an approach true to the Fathers before him and to Palamas after him. Such a division could be viewed as quite radical in the Byzantine context and one can only wonder if rationalism in any guise could ever have been accepted if the Empire had survived in 1453.

The place of the theology of Gregory of Cyprus in Byzantine religious thought has a dual significance. Primarily expounded as an answer to the 'filioque' controversy, in solving the problem it also transcended it by providing a significant if brief exposition of the essence/energy distinction. As has already been noted, Gregory's theology brought the first clarification of pneumatological thought at Byzantium since the time of Photios. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit had become a dead issue at Byzantium even in the wake of the 'filioque' controversies. Photios'

viewpoint or lack of one had sealed any further speculation on the problem. According to him, the Spirit proceeded from the Father only and the Son had almost no participation whatsoever in the temporal mission of the Spirit. As for the formula 'through the Son', he remained mute. Those who would argue that Photios' opinion was truly reflective of the attitude of the Church would be using an 'argumentum ex silentio' for, more often than not, he does not address himself at length to pressing pneumatological problems. (22) Even so, his outlook very often became the last word on the subject in later periods.

While it may be a slight exaggeration to say that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit became a dead issue in the centuries after Photios, it is true that the eternal relationship of the Son to the Spirit was never examined. When the Spirit was discussed, it was largely in terms of the χαρίσματα or gifts dispensed in His temporal mission. Both Symeon the New Theologian and Nicolas, Bishop of Methone, gave attention to this but said only that the charismata are distributed temporally by the hypostasis of the Spirit alone though belonging to the entire Trinity. (23) A contemporary of Gregory of Cyprus whose work is only now becoming known, the hieromonk Hierotheos, also made this observation but went a step further by underlining the close relationship between the Spirit and the Son in sharing the charismata as they are distributed temporally. (24) When the problem of the procession of the Holy Spirit was raised once again at thirteenth century Byzantium, the charismata issue confused Nikephoros Blemmydes. He identified the charismata as the hypostasis of the Spirit Itself and proclaimed that there was no difference between the charismata and the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son! (25) Bekkos' pneumatology, on the other hand, did not really represent a continuation of Blemmydes' particular errors but merely made an attempt to certify the filioque by disguising it in Byzantine terminology.

It can be seen from this digression that the procession of the Spirit was really not an issue which received serious speculation at Byzantium from the late ninth to the early thirteenth century, although theologians were dealing with the charismata which the Spirit distributed temporally. Obviously, these theologians were dealing with the idea of the charismata in complete isolation from the eternal life of the Spirit. And when Blemmydes attempted to make a connection, he did not know how to separate the charismata from the Spirit Itself. When the question of the filioque was forced into the open at Byzantium, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was still very much as it had been in Photios' time. Even Photios had allowed for the charismata, so the speculation concerning these was not a radical departure from his position. (26) This must be stressed so that it will not be thought that these discussions affected the Byzantine view of the eternal life of the Spirit.

Only with the appearance of the theology of Gregory of Cyprus was the connection proclaimed and it startled Byzantium. Gregory saw that in emphasising an eternal relationship between the Son and the Spirit, which the filioque problem reflected, the charismata were a link. Previously, these had been expressed only in the temporal sense of the Spirit's mission to the world, but the sharing of the same essence eternally by the Spirit and the Son meant that the charismata were also shared eternally. It was not the discussion of theologians since the time of Photios which inspired Gregory, however, but the early Church Fathers. While it could be implied that the constant attention given to the charismata since Photios acted as a catalyst in Gregory's mind, he never once quotes from a theologian later than John of Damascus. Hence, Gregory's position owed more to Byzantine theology prior to Photios than to theological speculation after him.

Since all three hypostases of the Trinity share the same characteristics other than the relation of origin which distinguishes them from one

another, the charismata belong to Father, Son, and Spirit. Because of the changeless nature of the Trinity, Gregory saw that these charismata had a dimension other than that of their temporal distribution. These charismata, always a property of the Divine, are also the 'manifestation' of his theology. He demonstrated their eternal nature by stressing that the 'manifestation' was shown in the Spirit through the Son from the Father even before man could experience it at his creation, (27) Through the concept of light, he further demonstrated the uncreated character of this 'manifestation'. To reach his conclusion, the Patriarch uses principally Athanasios, Gregory Thaumaturgos, Cyril of Alexandria, Maximos the Confessor, Pseudo-Dionysios, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil and John of Damascus.

A semantic problem arises in identifying Gregory's concept of *manifestation* with both patristic terminology and the idea of the charismata expressed by theologians of the ninth through thirteenth centuries. Although the word *ἐκφάνει* itself traceable to Pseudo-Dionysios, predominates in Gregory's writings to demonstrate his idea of *manifestation*, he identifies it with other words, especially *ἐνέργεια* (energy), *χάρις* and *δωρεά* (gift), all having occurred as early as Athanasios of Alexandria in describing the operations of God. (28) In speaking of the gifts of the Spirit dispensed temporally, theologians of the middle Byzantine period used the word *ἐνέργεια* interchangeably with *χαρίσματα*, (29) Despite the semantic similarity between the Patristic and the middle Byzantine usage, it was not until Gregory that all the terms were seen as synonyms. From these comparisons, it can be seen that the terminology used in describing Divine action or operation was a rather free one (and rather indefinite in revealing the full nature of the operations themselves).

Early Patristic retrospection aside, the theological writings of

Gregory of Cyprus bring us to the very threshold of the Palamite conception of God. Having emphasised the eternal nature and uncreated character of Divine manifestation, Gregory reflects upon the human reception of that manifestation. (30) It is here that he comes closest to the Palamite distinction between essence and energy and also the actuality of human participation in the energies. Having abandoned time as a factor in explaining manifestation, the Patriarch also abandons space. Completely stripping these conceptions away, Gregory demonstrates that God interacts freely with his creation through his glory and that He cannot be limited to essence alone because this would make Him inactive. But it is not through the essence that He interacts with man but through the enhypostasised energy or 'manifestation'. The necessity of abandoning spatial analogies with reference to God is later found in Palamas as is the refusal to limit Him to His essence. (31)

The antinomy of the essence and the *manifestation* is demonstrated in the series of questions Gregory of Cyprus poses at the end of the *De Processione*. Both are present simultaneously yet only the *manifestation* is distinguishable while the essence remains forever hidden. But here the Patriarch ends, affirming the concept of synergy but not explaining it. This task was eventually taken up by Palamas who reaffirmed the concept of 'theosis' in doing so. If Gregory of Cyprus' theology seems to end abruptly at this point, it must be remembered that the circumstances which prompted his theological speculation actually placed a greater emphasis on the internal life of the Trinity than on its economic life. Nonetheless, the experiential aspect of Gregory of Cyprus' theology matches that of Gregory Palamas in its vision of God in glory. Gregory of Cyprus' vision of God in glory is never far from the experience

of the hesychasts defended by Gregory Palamas. Just as Gregory of Cyprus insists upon the actual experience of the Divine Light, so does Gregory Palamas. This experience does not occur in the imagination, or through the reason but through direct experience. (33) Aisthesis is as much a part of Palamite doctrine as it is a part of Gregory of Cyprus' thought. Once again, it must be stressed that Gregory of Cyprus provides no method for the attainment of the experience but he never doubts that it is a real possibility.

It has recently been suggested that 'Palamism' had already been 'accepted by the Church' by the time of Gregory of Cyprus'. (34) In this context, 'Palamism' has been narrowed to mean the recognition of the energy/essence distinction and the possibility of man's participation in the energies. In light of the theology of Gregory of Cyprus and the reaction to it, the existence of 'Palamism' as a 'fait accompli' at late thirteenth century Byzantium cannot be accepted. If this were not the case, Gregory's theology would have been acknowledged without a stir. The thesis itself rests on an identification between Palamite theology and the theological thought concerning the charismata of the Spirit prior to Gregory of Cyprus. The willingness of middle Byzantine theologians to consider the charismata as part of the whole of Divinity and as participable has been interpreted as an acceptance of 'Palamism before Palamas'. Actually, these theologians were still some distance from the Palamite conception of God. They never broke with the purely temporal aspect of the charismata, they did not fully succeed in relating these to the eternal life of the Spirit and they offered crude spatial conceptions in linking them to the essence itself. (35)

If all these aspects had been clearly defined before the arrival of Gregory of Cyprus on the theological scene, there would have been no need for the tomos of 1285 to be written. As it stands, Gregory's theology

offers a far more sophisticated viewpoint than any of the theologians concerned with the charismata. Even the decisions of the local Constantinopolitan councils of 1156 and 1157 which decreed that all divine acts 'ad extra' are Trinitarian and not limited to any one Person of the Trinity were confined to the temporal dimension. (36) Thus, both individual theologians and conciliar decrees were still some distance from the formulation of Gregory of Cyprus and Gregory Palamas prior to 1204. If there is a doctrinal continuity to be found in a concept of 'Palamism before Palamas' stretching from the early Fathers to the fourteenth-century theologian himself, it exists because of Gregory of Cyprus.

The theology of Gregory of Cyprus stands at a watershed in Byzantine thought. Forced by historical circumstances to address the most challenging question in medieval thought, the Patriarch had two options before him: a repetition of the Photian formulae or a creative approach to the problem. In taking the latter course, he showed that Byzantine theology was still a dynamic discipline. Even more importantly, he demonstrated that man's relationship with God was not manifested in abstract speculation but in personal experience. Far too often, the theological activities of the Byzantines have been misinterpreted as reflecting a pre-occupation with the other-worldly. A careful examination of the thought of Gregory of Cyprus reveals instead that he and the Fathers who inspired him were just as concerned with the concrete experience of God in the here and now.

Notes - Conclusion

- (1) Cf. esp. p. 192 above where this aspect is particularly stressed by Choumnos in emulation of Gregory.
- (2) Cf. the remarks of F. Dölger, 'Byzantine Literature' CMH 4, ii, p. 248.
- (3) This 'holism' inherent in Byzantine aesthetics is ably demonstrated by S.S. Averentsieff, Poetika rannevisantijskoj literaturi (Moscow, 1977) who examines the problem within the context of early Byzantine literature.
- (4) Plotinus, Enneads I, VI, 8; M.C. Beardsley, Aesthetics from Classical Greece to the Present, (University, Alabama, reprint 1975), p. 82.
The concept of aisthesis is given its traditional Byzantine definition in Gregory of Nyssa. Oratio catechetica, MPG 45, cc. 25B-28B and in Gregory of Nazianzos, Oratio 45, MPG 36, c. 632AB.
- (5) Cf. Gregoras' remark, quoted above p. 62 and Gregory's compliment to Raoulaina, above p. 161.
- (6) Cf. above pp. 105-6 for the narrative and p. 149 for the reasons of confusion.
- (7) Cf. esp. Apologia, MPG 142, cc. 257A-258B and the entire sequence 253D-258B.
- (8) Cf. above p. 28.
- (9) Cf. above p. 102.
- (10) Cf. above p. 104.
- (11) Cf. the remarks concerning the Byzantine passion for compendia, F. Dölger, op. cit. n. 2, pp. 247-248.
- (12) Cf. above p. 102.
- (13) Cf. above p. 138.
- (14) Cf. above pp. 148-149. It is interesting to note in this context that Gregory gave an etymological reason for the choice of the

word 'manifestation' (ἐκφανσις) it came from the word light (φῶς or φάος) Cf. Apologia, MPG 142, cc. 265D-266A.

- (15) Cf. above p. 147.
- (16) Plotinus, Enneads V, VIII, II; M.C. Beardsley, op. cit. n. 4, p. 83.
- (17) De Processione, MPG 142, cc. 289D-290A.
- (18) Cf. above p. 200.
- (19) For a full explanation of the principle of relations of opposition, cf. above pp. 134-135.
- (20) Gregory of Nazianzos, Sanctum Baptisma MPG 36, c. 417B, Maximos the Confessor, Capita theologica et oeconomica, MPG 90, c. 11125A.
- (21) V. Lossky, A l'image et à la ressemblance de Dieu (Paris, 1967), p. 80, (English translation, In the Image and Likeness of God (St. Vladimir's Press, 1974), p. 84).
- (22) Cf. above pp. 134.
- (23) Symeon the New Theologian, Traitées theologiques et ethiques (Sources Chrétiennes 122, Paris, 1966), 1, p. 209, 2 (Sources Chrétiennes 129, Paris, 1967), pp. 12, 78, 98, Catechèses 2 (Sources Chrétiennes 104, Paris, 1964), pp. 196, 368; Hymnes 2 (Sources Chrétiennes 174, Paris 1971), pp. 70, 384.

Nicolas of Methone, quoted in A. Demetrakopoulos, Ἑλληνοεὐαγγελιστικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη, (Leipzig, 1866), p. 208.

I am indebted to A. Patacsi, 'Palamism before Palamas', Eastern Churches Review, 9, 1-2, (1977), pp. 64-71, for these observations
- (24) A. Patacsi, op. cit. n. 23, p. 69. All of Hierotheos' work remains unpublished so I am dependent on the observations of this article.
- (25) N. Blemmydes, De Processione, MPG, 142, c. 540.
- (26) Photios, Mystagogia, MPG 102, c. 337.
- (27) Gregory of Cyprus, Apologia, MPG 142, c. 266C.
- (28) Pseudo-Dionysios, De divinis nominibus, MPG 3, c. 640D, Introduced by Gregory in Tomus fidei MPG 142, c. 241A; Athanasios, Epistola

I ad Serapionem, MFG 26, c. 600C; references by Gregory in Apologia MFG 142, c. 260B and De Processione, MFG 142, c. 289D.

- (29) Cf. references in n. 23 above.
- (30) De Processione, MFG 142, c. 289D-290A.
- (31) Gregory Palamas, Défense des saintes hésychastes, ed. J. Meyendorff (Louvain, 1959), Triad I, pp. 112-114, idem. Capita, MFG 150, 1216D.
L.C. Contos, 'The Essence-Energies Structure of St. Gregory Palamas with a Brief Examination of Its Patristic Foundation,' Greek Orthodox Theological Review, 12(1967), pp. 288-289.
- (33) Gregory Palamas, op. cit. n. 31, Triad I, p. 14; K.T. Ware, 'The Debate About Palamism', Eastern Churches Review 9, 1-2(1977), pp. 50-51.
- (34) A. Patacsi, op. cit. n. 23, p. 64.
- (35) A. Patacsi, op. cit. n. 23, pp. 65-70.
- (36) J. Meyendorff, Byzantine Theology (English edition: Oxford, 1975) p. 187.

APPENDICES

The Works of Gregory of Cyprus

- (1) Ἀπολογία, MPG 142, cc. 251-267.
- (2) Διηγήσεως μερικῆς λόγος τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν περιέχων, (Autobiography), MPG 142, cc. 19-30.
- (3) Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν Αὐτοκράτορα Κύρον Ἀνδρόνικον Παλαιολόγον, MPG 142, cc. 387-418 (=Anecdota Graeca 1, ed. J.F. Boissonade, Paris 1829, pp. 359-393).
- (4) Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν Αὐτοκράτορα Κύρον Μιχαὴλ Παλαιολόγον καὶ Νέον Κωνσταντῖνον, MPG 142, cc. 346-386 (Anecdota Graeca 1, ed. J.F. Boissonade, Paris, 1829, pp. 346-386).
- (5) Ἐγκώμιον εἰς Ἀγίου Διονύσιον τὸν Ἀρεοπαγίτην, Εὐαγγελικὴ Εἰσαγγελία (1854), pp. 356-370.
- (6) Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν Ἀγίου Εὐθύμιον Μαδύτων, Δελτίον Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας 4, (1894), pp. 387-422.
- (7) Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὴν Θάλασσαν, εἶτουν εἰς τὴν τοῦ καθόλου τοῦ ὕδατος φύσιν, MPG 142, cc. 433-44.
- (8) Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν Ἀγίου Λάζαρον, AASS November 3 : 588-606.
- (9) Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὴν Ἀγίαν Μαρίναν, Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμάς, 29 (1935), pp. 189-200, 227-239.
- (10) Λόγος εἰς τὸν ἔγιον καὶ μεγαλομάρτυρα καὶ τροπαιοφόρον Γεώργιον, MPG 142, cc. 299-346.
- (11) Λόγος περὶ ἡρείας, MPG 142, cc. 417-421.
Μελέται
- (12) Οἱ Ποτιδαῖται ἐλλήλων ἐγεύσαντο ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων κοιλιόρχοι, καὶ γράφονται Ἀθηναῖους ἀσεβείας Κορίνθιοι, Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπολογούμενοι, Libanius Opera, ed. R. Foerster, v. 6, pp. 52-82, 12 vols. (Leipzig, 1962). (pp. 52-69 = Georgii Cyprii Declamationes e codice Leidensi editae, ed. M. Schmidt, part 1, pp. 4-15, Jena 1875. Pp. 69-82 ibid; ed. M. Schmidt, part 2, pp. 3-10, Jena 1876.

- (13) Φιλργύρου παῖς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ νοσήσαντος ηὔξατο τάλαντον τῇ Διὶ ἀναθήσειν, εἰ ὑγιῇ ἀπολάβοι τὸν πατέρα, ὃ δὲ ἀνενεγχὼν ἀποκηρύττει τὸν παῖδα, μελετῶμεν δὲ τὸν παῖδα, Libanius Opera, ed. R. Foerster, v. 7, pp. 142-179, Leipzig, 1902. (To section 27 also edited by O. Miller, Jena, 1890.)
- (14) φιλόσοφος ἀνελθὼν εἰς ἀκρόπολιν καὶ παίσας τὸν τύραννον ἀποθέσθαι τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἰδιωτεῦσαι, αἰτεῖ τὴν παρὰ τῶν νόμων ἐπὶ τούτῳ δωρεάν καὶ ἀντιλέγεται, op. cit., n. 12, ed. M. Schmidt, part 2, pp. 11-17, Jena 1876, part 3, pp. 3-8, Jena 1877.
- (15) Μῦθοι, ed. S. Eustratiades Γρηγορίου τοῦ Κυπρίου ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ μῦθοι, pp. 215-230, Alexandria, 1910.
- (16) Ὁμολογία (Confessio), MPG 142, cc. 247-252.
- (17) Παροιμίαι (Proverbia), MPG 142, cc. 445-469.
- (18) Περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (De Processione), MPG cc. 269-300.
- (19) Πιττάχιον, MPG 142, cc. 267-269.
- (20) Τόμος πίστεως (Tomus fidei), MPG 142, cc. 233-246.

Works Attributed to Gregory of Cyprus

Ἐτέρα ἔγγραφος ἀσφάλεια τῆς τοιαύτης δυσσεβείας ἣν καὶ ἐλογογράφησεν ὁ Κύπριος καὶ πάντες οἱ τοῦ παλατίου ἄρχοντες ὑπέγραψαν -

(Another declaration in writing of that impiety which Cyprius formulated and all the officials of the palace signed) in J. Gill, 'The Church Union of the Council of Lyons (1274) Portrayed in Greek Documents', OCP 40(1974), pp. 32-35.

ὑπόσχεσις καὶ συμφωνία καὶ χρυσοβούλλιος λόγος περὶ τῆς τῶν Λατίνων, ὑποθέσεως ἀπὸ τοῦ Παλαιολόγου ἐκείνου μετὰ θάνατον τοῦ Καρούλου ἐκείνου συγγραφεῖς παρὰ τοῦ Κυπρίου

(Promise and agreement and chrysobull statement about the business of the Latins from the late Palaeologus after the death of the late Charles drawn up by the Cypriot), ibid., pp. 12-19.

Works Erroneously Attributed to Gregory of Cyprus

Κατὰ τῶν τοῦ Βέκκου βλασφημιῶν, an addendum to the De Processione in MPG 142, cc. 290-300. Actually part of a work written by George Mouzalon.

Πόνημα κατὰ Λατίνων, in Cod. Leidensis B.P.G. 49, ff. 114-116. Demetrakopoulos, in Orthodoxos Hellas, p. 65 attributes it to Gregory but Codices Manuscripti VIII, Codices Bibliothecae Publicae Graeci, Leyden, 1965, p. 68 gives the authorship to Manuel Moschopoulos.

Λόγοι, in MPG 140, cc. 643-758, attributed by S. Papadopoulos in OHE 4, c. 734, to Gregory of Cyprus, actually written by Patriarch Germanos II of Constantinople. See Dict. de Spiritualité 6 (1967), cc. 922-923.

The Letters of Gregory of Cyprus

| <u>Iameere's Chronology</u> | <u>Eustratiades' Chronology</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Address</u> |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1 | 1 | EF 1, 107-8 | Neokaisareites |
| 2 | 2 | " " 409-410 | C. Akropolites |
| 3 | 3 | " " 410 | The monk Iasites |
| 4 | 4 | " " 411-412 | " " " |
| 5 | 5 | " " 412 | Meliteniotes |
| 6 | 6 | " " 412-413 | Neokaisareites |
| 7 | 7 | " " 413 | Demetrios Veaskos |
| 8 | 8 | " " 414-415 | The mystikos John |
| 9 | 9 | " " 415-417 | Isaac of Ephesos |
| 10 | 10 | " " 417 | Xiphilinos |
| 11 | 11 | " " 417-418 | Neokaisareites |
| 12 | 12 | " " 418 | John Theognostos |
| 13 | 13 | " " 419 | " " |
| 14 | 14 | " " 419-420 | Staurakios |
| 15 | 15 | " " 420-421 | John Theognostos |
| 16 | 16 | " " 421 | Neokaisareites |
| 17 | 17 | " " 421 | " |
| 18 | 18 | " " 422 | " |
| 19 | 19 | " " 422 | " |
| 20 | 20 | " " 422 | Staurakios |
| 21 | 21 | " " 423-424 | " |
| 22 | 22 | " " 424 | " |
| 23 | 23 | " " 424 | " |
| 24 | 24 | " " 425 | Neokaisareites |
| 25 | 25 | " " 425 | " |
| 26 | 26 | " " 425-426 | " |
| 27 | 27 | " " 426-427 | Meliteniotes |

| <u>Jameore's Chronology</u> | <u>Eustratiades' Chronology</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Address</u> |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| 28 | 28 | <u>EF</u> 1, 427-428 | Staurakios |
| 29 | 29 | " " 428-429 | Athanasios Chatzikes |
| 30 | 30 | " " 429 | Skoutariotes |
| 31 | 31 | " " 429 | Neokaisareites |
| 32 | 32 | " " 429 | " |
| 33 | 33 | " " 430 | " |
| 34 | 34 | " " 430-431 | " |
| 35 | 35 | " " 431-433 | Pediasimos, Chartophylax of Ochrid |
| 36 | 36 | " " 433 | Neokaisareites |
| 37 | 37 | " " 434 | Bishop of Priene |
| 38 | 38 | " " 434 | Constantine Akropolites |
| 39 | 39 | " " 435 | " " |
| 40 | 40 | " " 435-436 | Some of the speakers |
| 41 | 41 | " " 436-437 | " " " " |
| 42 | 42 | " " 437 | Nikephoros Choumnos |
| 43 | 43 | " " 437-438 | Neokaisareites |
| 44 | 44 | " " 438-439 | " |
| 45 | 45 | " " 439 | " |
| 46 | 46 | <u>EF</u> 2, 195-196 | " |
| 47 | 47 | " " 196-197 | Deacon Kallistos |
| 48 | 48 | " " 197 | To himself |
| 49 | 49 | " " 197-198 | Neokaisareites |
| 50 | 50 | " " 198 | To himself |
| 51 | 51 | " " 198-199 | Neokaisareites |
| 52 | 52 | " " 199 | Papagamencs |
| 53 | 53 | " " 199-200 | Grand Logothete to the Patriarch |
| 54 | 54 | " " 200-201 | Mouzalon |
| 55 | 55 | " " 201 | Mouzalon |
| 56 | 56 | " " 201-202 | " |

| <u>Lameere's Chronology</u> | <u>Eustratiades' Chronology</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Address</u> |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| 57 | 57 | EF 2, 202-203 | Neokaisareites |
| 58 | 58 | " " 203 | Skoutariotes |
| 59 | 59 | " " 203-204 | Neokaisareites |
| 60 | 60 | " " 204-205 | Mouzalon |
| 61 | 61 | " " 206 | " |
| 62 | 62 | " " 206-207 | Neokaisareites |
| 63 | 63 | " " 207 | Saponopoulos |
| 64 | 64 | " " 207-209 | " |
| 65 | 65 | " " 209-211 | " |
| 66 | 66 | EF 3, 5-6 | Meliteniotes |
| 67 | 67 | " " 6 | Neokaisareites |
| 68 | 68 | " " 6 | " |
| 69 | 69 | " " 7 | Pachymeres |
| 70 | 70 | " " 7-8 | Neokaisareites |
| 71 | 71 | " " 8-9 | Job Iasites |
| 72 | 72 | " " 9-11 | Meliteniotes |
| 73 | 73 | " " 11-12 | Methodios the monk |
| 74 | 74 | " " 12-13 | Agathon Korese |
| 75 | 75 | " " 13-14 | Meliteniotes |
| 76 | 76 | " " 14-15 | Staurakios |
| 77 | 77 | " " 15-16 | " |
| 78 | 78 | " " 16 | George Marmaras |
| 79 | 79 | " " 17 | John Theognostos |
| 80 | 80 | " " 17-18 | Saponopoulos |
| 81 | 81 | " " 18-19 | Xiphilinos* |
| 82 | 82 | " " 19 | Staurakios |

* Eustratiades suggests that this letter may be to Skoutariotes, but Vat. gr. 1085 gives the name of Xiphilinos.

| <u>Lameere's Chronology</u> | <u>Eustratiades' Chronology</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Address</u> |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 83 | 83 | EF 3, 20 | John Theognostos |
| 84 | 84 | " " 21-22 | Theodosios of Kyzikos |
| 85 | 85 | " " 22-23 | " " " |
| 86 | 86 | " " 23 | Saponopoulos |
| 87 | 87 | " " 23-24 | Neokaisareites |
| 88 | 88 | " " 24-25 | Meliteniotes |
| 89 | 192 | EF 5, 491-492 | |
| 90 | 89 | EF 3, 25-26 | Agathon Korese and Neokai- sareites |
| 91 | 194 | EF 5, 494-495 | Neokaisareites |
| 92 | 197 | " " 497-500 | Meliteniotes |
| 93 | 90 | EF 3, 26 | " |
| 94 | 91 | " " 27-28 | Mouzalon and the other speakers |
| 95 | 92 | " " 28 | Holobolos |
| 96 | 93 | " " 28 | To epi ton deiseon |
| 97 | 94 | " " 28 | " " " " |
| 98 | 95 | " " 29 | " " " " |
| 99 | 96 | " " 29 | Holobolos |
| 100 | 97 | " " 29-31 | Meliteniotes |
| 101 | 98 | " " 31 | To epi ton deiseon |
| 102 | 99 | " " 31-33 | Staurakios |
| 103 | 100 | " " 33 | Methodios the Monk |
| 104 | 101 | " " 34 | " " " |
| 105 | 102 | " " 34 | John Phakrases |
| 106 | 103 | " " 34-35 | Meliteniotes |
| 107 | 104 | " " 36 | Doukaites |
| 108 | 105 | " " 37 | Fachymeres |
| 109 | 106 | " " 38-39 | Staurakios |
| 110 | 107 | " " 39-40 | John Theognostos |

| <u>Iameere's Chronology</u> | <u>Eustratiades' Chronology</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Address</u> |
|---------------------------------|--|----------------------|------------------------------|
| 111 | 108 | <u>EF</u> 3, 40-41 | Neokaisareites* |
| 112 | 109 | " " 41-42 | Mouzalon |
| 113 | 110 | " " 42 | Meliteniotes |
| 114 | 111 | " " 42-43 | George Akropolites |
| 115 | 112 | " " 44-45 | Mouzalon |
| 116 | 113 | " " 45 | Iasites the monk |
| 117 | Vat. gr. 1085 f. 222rv (letter 113) | | To epi ton deiseon |
| 118 | 114 | <u>EF</u> 3, 45-47 | John Theognostos |
| 119 | 196 | <u>EF</u> 5, 496-497 | no address |
| 120 | Vat. gr. 1085 f. 252rv (letter 176) | | Staurakios |
| 121 | Vat. gr. 1085 ff. 252v, 253r (letter 177) | | Staurakios |
| 122 | Naples II C 33 (letter 122) | | |
| 123 | 193 | <u>EF</u> 5, 492-493 | Meliteniotes |
| 124 | Vat. gr. 1696 ff. 3v, 4r (letter 124) | | Mouzalon |
| 125 | Vat. gr. 1696 ff. 5v, 6r (letter 125) | | no address |
| 126 | 195 | <u>EF</u> 5, 494-496 | Some of the speakers |
| 127 | Vat. gr. 1696 f. 29v (letter 127) | | " " " " |
| 128 | 115 | <u>EF</u> 3, 47-48 | Mouzalon |
| 129 | 116 | " " 281-282 | Grand Logothete to Patriarch |
| 130 | 117 | " " 282-284 | Mouzalon |
| 131 | 118 | " " 284-285 | Grand Logothete to Patriarch |
| 132 | 119 | " " 285-286 | Mouzalon |

* In Vat. gr. 1085, the copyist has put 'to epi ton deiseon' when the opening of the letter clearly shows it is for Neokaisareites.

| <u>Lameere's Chronology</u> | <u>Eustratiades' Chronology</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Address</u> |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 133 | 120 | <u>EF</u> 3, 286-287 | Mouzalon |
| 134 | 121 | " " 288 | The monks John and Daniel |
| 135 | 122 | " " 289 | Holobolos |
| 136 | 123 | " " 290 | Mouzalon |
| 137 | 124 | " " 290-291 | " |
| 138 | 125 | " " 291-292 | " |
| 139 | 126 | " " 292-293 | Daniel Glykes |
| 140 | 127 | " " 292-294 | Mouzalon |
| 141 | 128 | " " 294-295 | " |
| 142 | 129 | " " 295-296 | " |
| 143 | 130 | " " 296 | Mouzalon (or Emperor) |
| 144 | 131 | <u>EF</u> 4, 5-11 | Sebastocrator John |
| 145 | 132 | " " 11-15 | Andronikos Palaiologos |
| 146 | 133 | " " 15-18 | " " |
| 147 | 134 | " " 18-21 | " " |
| 148 | 135 | " " 21-22 | Mouzalon |
| 149 | 136 | " " 22-23 | " |
| 150 | 137 | " " 24-25 | Andronikos Palaiologos |
| 151 | 138 | " " 25-27 | " " |
| 152 | 139 | " " 27-28 | Mouzalon |
| 153 | 140 | " " 28 | " |
| 154 | 141 | " " 29 | " |
| 2 155 | 142 | " " 97-98 | Andronikos Palaiologos |
| 156 | 143 | " " 98-99 | " " |
| 157 | 144 | " " 99-101 | Mouzalon |
| 158 | 145 | " " 101-102 | " |
| 159 | 146 | " " 102-103 | Andronikos Palaiologos |
| 160 | 147 | " " 103-104 | Athanasios Lependrenos |
| 161 | 148 | " " 104-105 | " " |

| <u>Iameere's Chronology</u> | <u>Eustratiades' Chronology</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Address</u> |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| 162 | 149 | <u>EF</u> 4, 105-106 | Mouzalon |
| 163 | 150 | " " 106-107 | " |
| 164 | 151 | " " 107-108 | " |
| 165 | 152 | " " 108-109 | To a certain monk (Methodios) |
| 166 | 153 | " " 109-110 | Mouzalon |
| 167 | 154 | " " 110-113 | " |
| 168 | 155 | " " 113-114 | " |
| 169 | 156 | " " 114-115 | Grand Logothete to Patriarch |
| 170 | 157 | " " 115-116 | Mouzalon |
| 171 | 158 | " " 116-118 | Raoulaina |
| 172 | 159 | " " 119 | Mouzalon |
| 173 | 160 | " " 120-121 | " |
| 174 | Iveron Athous 184 (letter 174) | | |
| 175 | 161 | <u>EF</u> 4, 121 | Mouzalon |
| 176 | 162 | " " 121-122 | " |
| 177 | 163 | " " 123 | " |
| 178 | 164 | " " 123-124 | " |
| 179 | 165 | " " 125 | " |
| 180 | 166 | " " 126-128 | " |
| 181 | 167 | <u>EF</u> 5, 213-214 | John Theognostos |
| 182 | 168 | " " 214-215 | Mouzalon |
| 183 | 169 | " " 215-216 | Constantine Akropolites |
| 184 | 170 | " " 216-217 | Mouzalon |
| 185 | 171 | " " 217-223 | A monk of acquaintance (Methodios) |
| 186 | 172 | " " 223-224 | Mouzalon |
| 187 | 173 | " " 224-226 | " |
| 188 | 174 | " " 339-341 | " |
| 189 | 175 | " " 341-343 | " |

| Lameere's Chronology | Eustratiades' Chronology | Location | Address |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|
| 190 | 176 | EF 5, 343-344 | Constantine Cheilas |
| 191 | 177 | " " 344 | Mouzalon |
| 192 | 178 | " " 344-346 | John Cheilas |
| 193 | 179 | " " 346-347 | " " |
| 194 | 180 | " " 348 | Mouzalon |
| 195 | 181 | " " 348-349 | " |
| 196 | 182 | " " 349-350 | " |
| 197 | 183 | " " 350-351 | " |
| 198 | 184 | " " 351-352 | " |
| 199 | 185 | " " 444-445 | " |
| 200 | 186 | " " 445-450 | Protovestiarios (Mouzalon) to Patriarch |
| 201 | Wat. gr. 1085 ff. 254v, 255r (letter 184) | | Raoulaina |
| 202 | " " " | ff. 258rv (letter 193) | " |
| 203 | " " " | ff. 258v, 259r (letter 195) | " |
| 204 | " " " | f. 259rv (letter 199) | " |
| 205 | " " " | ff. 264v, 265r (letter 226) | " |
| 206 | " " " | f. 259v (letter 200) | " |
| 207 | " " " | f. 259r (letter 196) | " |
| 208 | Mut. gr. 82 | f. 177rv (letter 193) | " |
| 209 | Wat. gr. 1085 ff. 259v, 260r (letter 201) | | " |
| 210 | " " " | f. 257v (letter 191) | " |
| 211 | " " " | f. 259r (letter 197) | " |
| 212 | " " " | f. 260r (letter 202) | " |
| 213 | " " " | f. 260r (letter 203) | " |
| 214 | " " " | f. 260rv (letter 204) | " |
| 215 | " " " | f. 260v (letter 205) | " |

| <u>Ianeere's</u> <u>Chronology</u> | <u>Eustratiades'</u> <u>Chronology</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Address</u> |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| 216 Vat. gr. 1085 f. 260v | | (letter 206) | Constantine |
| 217 " " " f. 262r | | (letter 212) | Raoulaina |
| 218 " " " f. 257v | | (letter 189) | Mouzalon |
| 219 " " " f. 261v | | (letter 209) | John Cheilas |
| 220 " " " f. 261v | | (letter 210) | John Cheilas and Daniel Glykes |
| 221 " " " ff. 261v, 262r | | (letter 211) | John Cheilas |
| 222 " " " f. 262r | | (letter 213) | Some of the speakers |
| 223 " " " f. 257v | | (letter 190) | Mouzalon |
| 224 " " " f. 259r | | (letter 198) | Mouzalon |
| 225 " " " ff. 260v, 261r | | (letter 207) | John Theognostos |
| 226 " " " f. 261rv | | (letter 208) | The oikonomos |
| 227 " " " f. 262r | | (letter 214) | Raoulaina |
| 228 | 187 | <u>EF</u> 5, 450-451 | " |
| 229 Vat. gr. 1085 f. 263r | | (letter 216) | " |
| 230 " " " f. 263rv | | (letter 217) | " |
| 231 " " " f. 263v | | (letter 218) | " |
| 232 " " " f. 263v | | (letter 219) | " |
| 233 " " " f. 263v | | (letter 220) | " |
| 234 " " " f. 263v | | (letter 221) | " |
| 235 | 188 | <u>EF</u> 5, 489-490 | " |
| 236 | 189 | " " 490 | " |
| 237 Vat. gr. 1085 f. 264r | | (letter 224) | " |
| 238 " " " ff. 257v, 258r | | (letter 192) | " |
| 239 " " " f. 264rv | | (letter 225) | " |
| 240 " " " | | <u>EF</u> 5, 491 | Some of the Bishops |
| 241 Par. Gr. 2022 | | (letter 241) | |
| 242 " " " | | (letter 242) | |

'Abdication' Documents

| <u>Lameere's</u> <u>Chronology</u> | <u>Eustratiades'</u> <u>Chronology</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Address</u> |
|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| A Mut. gr. 82 ff 192rv, 193r | | | 'A Denial'* |
| B | 190 | <u>EF</u> 5, 490-491 | Some of the Bishops |
| C | | <u>MPG</u> 142 cc. 125E-128C | " " " " |
| D | 198 | <u>EF</u> 5, 500 | Declaration of Gregory's Orthodoxy |
| E | | Pachymeres II pp. 130-131 | Letter of Resignation |

no number - Letter to Henry II of Lusignan, in W. Lameere, La tradition
manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre, pp.
193-194.

* Misplaced by Lameere. This is not an abdication document but the document suspending clerics ordained by Eekkos (1285).

A letter of John Cheilas to the Emperor

MIG, CXLII, cols. 245-246;

It is the general belief of the Church that the Procession is an unchanging characteristic of the Holy Spirit demonstrating nothing other than its natural coming into being (or existence) from the Father. Therefore, to declare and write that this Procession, in theological terms, sometimes signifies its existence, sometimes its eternal manifestation, or its radiance, or its revelation - this is blasphemy and contrary to apostolic doctrine, and moreover worthy of anathema. (For) it is the common understanding and confession of the Fathers that the projector is the cause of the Holy Spirit, just as the Creator is the cause of the Son. In addition, all are in unanimous agreement that the terms projection and procession have the same force. Consequently, he who thinks, proclaims or writes otherwise, to the effect that the projector sometimes means the cause of the Holy Spirit and the projection its natural emergence from the Father Himself, sometimes that the former is the agent of (its) manifestation and the latter the eternal manifestation, or radiance, or revelation of the Holy Spirit - he is clearly blasphemous in our view and patently contrary to received truth, and therefore fit to be rejected and shunned. Similarly, the holy Fathers have always believed and maintained that the emanation of the Holy Spirit is itself indicative of its unique emergence, just like its procession and projection. Those therefore who pervert this statement by proclaiming and writing that, according to Holy Scripture, the emanation is somehow indicative of the emergence (of the Holy Spirit) and somehow also of its revelation, manifestation and radiance, must be accounted falsifiers of right belief, far removed from the truth, and moreover worthy of real hatred and rejection. The Holy Church of God holds these beliefs as from on high, to proclaim, teach and confess them in this fashion. We also, from the beginning until now, have inherited from Her (the Church) the same beliefs, to proclaim, teach and

confess them in like manner. If then those who hitherto have differed from us in this matter were to make their confession of faith, by word of mouth and in writing, embracing what is clearly the truth and rejecting by anathema their blasphemy, as we do, then they will henceforth be our true brethren in orthodoxy. They will have perfect peace and reconciliation with us and find a welcome from our hearts. If not, which heaven forbid, there can be no peace at all between us.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPTS

1. Vaticanus graecus 1085 Letters of Gregory of Cyprus
fols. 254v-265r
2. Vaticanus graecus 1696 Letters of Gregory of Cyprus
fols. 3v-6r, fol. 29v
3. Mutinensis graecus 82
fol. 177rv A letter of Gregory of Cyprus
fols. 192r-195r Patriarchal Documents of Gregory of Cyprus

I. Collections of Sources

- E. Barker, Social and Political Thought in Byzantium From Justinian I to the Last Palaeologus, Oxford, 1957.
- J.F. Boissonade, Anecdota Graeca, 5 vols., Paris, 1829-33 - Anecdota Nova, Paris, 1844.
- Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, Bonn, 1828-97.
- J. Darrouzès, Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine, Paris 1966.
- A.C. Demetrakopoulos, Ὁρθόδοξος Ἑλλάς, Leipzig, 1872.
- S. Eustratiades, Γρηγορίου τοῦ Κυπρίου ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ μῦθοι, Alexandria, 1910.
- P. Labbe, Sacrosancta Concilia, Paris, 1670-1672.
- V. Laurent, Les Régestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople, I, fasc. 4: Les Régestes de 1208 à 1309 (Le Patriarcat Byzantin. Recherches de diplomatique, d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques publiées par l'Institut d'Etudes Byzantines, Paris, Série 1), Paris 1971.
- J.P. Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graecolatina, Paris 1857-1866.
- G.A. Rhalles and M. Potles, Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων 6 vols. Athens, 1852-1859.
- K.N. Sathas, Μεσαιωνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη, (Bibliotheca graeca medii aevi) Venice/Paris, 1872-1894, 7 vols.

II. Works of Gregory of Cyprus

1. Ἀπολογία, MPG 142, cc. 251-267.
2. Διηγήσεως μερικῆς λόγος τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν περιέχων, (Autobiography), MPG 142, cc. 19-30.
3. Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν Αὐτοκράτορα Κύρον Ἀνδρόνικον Παλαιολόγον, MPG 142, cc. 387-418 (=Anecdota Graeca I, ed. J.F. Boissonade, Paris 1829, pp. 359-393)
4. Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν Αὐτοκράτορα Κύρον Μιχαὴλ Παλαιολόγον καὶ Νέον Κωνσταντῖνον

- MPG 142, cc. 346-386, (Anecdota Graeca I, ed. J.F. Boissonade, Paris 1829, pp. 346-386).
5. Ἐγκώμιον εἰς "Ἅγιον Διονύσιον τὸν Ἀρεοπαγίτην, Εὐαγγελικὴν Σάλπιγγα (1854), pp. 356-370.
 6. Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν "Ἅγιον Εὐθύμιον Μαδύτων, Δελτίον Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας, 4, (1894), pp. 387-422.
 7. Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὴν Θάλασσαν, εἵτουν εἰς τὴν τοῦ καθόλου τοῦ ὕδατος φύσιν, MPG 142, cc. 433-44.
 8. Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν "Ἅγιον Λάζαρον - AASS November 3 : 588-606.
 9. Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὴν Ἁγίαν Μαρίναν, Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς - 29 (1935), pp. 189-200, 227-239.
 10. Λόγος εἰς τὸν ἅγιον καὶ μεγαλομάρτυρα καὶ τροπαιοφόρον Γεώργιον, MPG 142, cc. 299-346.
 11. Λόγος περὶ ἁγίας, MPG 142, cc. 417-421.
μελέται
 12. Οἱ Ποτιδαιῶται ἀλλήλων ἐγεύσαντο ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων πολιορχούμενοι, καὶ γράφονται Ἀθηναίους ἀσεβείας Κορίνθιοι, Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπολογούμενοι, Libanius Opera, ed. R. Foerster, v. 6, pp. 52-82, 12 vols., (Leipzig 1902) (pp. 52-69 = Georgii Cyprii Declamationes e codice Leidensi editae, ed. M. Schmidt, part 1, pp. 4-15, Jena 1875. Pp. 69-82 = ibid.; ed. M. Schmidt, part 2; pp. 3-10, Jena 1876).
 13. Φιλαργύρου παῖς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ νοσήσαντος ἤρξατο τάλαντον τῷ Διὶ ἀναθήσειν, εἰ ὑγιῇ ἀπολάβοι τὸν πατέρα, ὁ δὲ ἀνενεγκὼν ἀποκηρύττει τὸν παῖδα, μελετῶμεν δὲ τὸν παῖδα - Libanius Opera, ed. R. Foerster, v. 7, pp. 142-179, Leipzig, 1902. (To section 27 also edited by O. Miller, Jena 1890.)
 14. Φιλόσοφος ἀνελθὼν εἰς ἀκρόπολιν καὶ πείσας τὸν τύραννον ἀποθέσθαι τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἰδιωτεῦσαι, αἰτεῖ τὴν παρὰ τῶν νόμων ἐπὶ τούτῳ δωρεὰν καὶ ἀντιλέγεται - op. cit. n. 12, ed. M. Schmidt, part 2, pp. 11-17, Jena 1876, part 3, pp. 3-8, Jena, 1877.

15. Μῦθοι - ed. S. Eustratiades, Γρηγορίου τοῦ Κυπρίου ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ μῦθοι, pp. 215-230, Alexandria, 1910.
16. Ὁμολογία (Confessio), MPG 142, cc. 247-252.
17. Παροιμίαι (Proverbia), MPG 142, cc. 445-469.
18. Περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (De Processione), MPG cc. 269-300.
19. Πιττάκιον, MPG 142, cc. 267-269.
20. Τόμος πίστεως (Tomus fidei), MPG 142, cc. 233-246.

III. The Letters of Gregory of Cyprus

Τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου Κύρου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Κυπρίου Ἐπιστολαί, - EF 1(1908), pp. 76-108, 409-439; 2(1908), pp. 195-211; 3(1909), pp. 5-48, 281-296; 4(1909) pp. 5-29, 97-128; 5(1910), pp. 213-226, 339-352, 444-451, 489-500. (Reprinted in S. Eustratiades, Γρηγορίου τοῦ Κυπρίου ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ μῦθοι - Alexandria, 1910.)

Letter to Henry II of Lusignan in W. Lameere, La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre, pp. 193-194, Brussels, 1937.

IV. Original Sources

- G. Akropolites, Historia, ed. A. Heisenberg, Leipzig, 1903.
- Anonymous, Zitie prepodobnago Afanasija Afonskago, ed. I. Pomjalovskij, St. Petersburg, 1895.
- Arethas, Scriptora minora II, ed. L.G. Westerink, Leipzig, 1972.
- Arsenius Autoreianos, Testamentum, in MPG 140, cc. 947-958.
- Athanasios I, Letters, in The Correspondence of Athanasios I, ed. A.M.N. Talbot, Washington, D.C., 1975.

- M. Attaleiates, Historia, in CSHB, ed. W. Brunet, Bonn, 1883.
- N. Blennydes, Curriculum Vitae et Carmina, ed. A. Heisonberg, Leipzig, 1896.
- Orationes de Processione Spiritus Sancti, in MPG 142, cc. 533-584.
- J. Bekkos, Refutatio libri Georgii Cyprii, in MPG 141, cc. 863-926.
- De unione Ecclesiarum, in MPG 141, cc. 15-158.
- J. Cheilas, Letter to the Emperor, in MPG 142, cc. 242-246.
- On the Arsenite Schism, in Documents inédits d'Ecclésiologie byzantine, ed. J. Darrouzès, Paris, 1966.
- N. Choumnos, Enkomion to Theoleptos, in Anecdota Graeca, ed. J.F. Boissonade v. 5, pp. 201-213, Paris, 1833.
- Pamphlets Against T. Metochites, in Anecdota Graeca, ed. J.F. Boissonade, vol. 3, pp. 356-391, Paris, 1831.
- Letters, in Anecdota Nova, ed. J.F. Boissonade, Paris, 1844.
- George the Monk, Chronicon, MPG 109, cc. 823-984.
- N. Gregoras, Byzantina Historia, in CSHB, ed. L. Schopen, 3 vols., Bonn, 1829-1855.
- Letters, in Correspondance de N. Gregoras, ed. R. Guiland, Paris, 1927.
- M. Holobolos, Orationes, ed. M. Treu, Potsdam, 1906-7.
- J. Kalothetos, Life of Athanasios I, ed. A. Pantocratorinus, in Θρακικά 13(1940), Athens.
- Anna Komnene, Alexiad, ed. A. Reifferscheid, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1884.
- J.L. LaMonte, Register of the Cartulary of Nikosia, B 5 (1929-30).
- T. Laskaris, Epistolae CCXVII, Florence, 1898.
- Mark the Monk, Report to the Synod, ed. A. Papadakis, in GRFS 16, 2(1975) pp. 236-239.
- C. Meliteniotes, De unione, in MPG 141, cc. 1031-1274.
- G. Metochites, De Processione Spiritus Sancti (fragment), in MPG 141, cc. 1275-1308.
- Historia dogmatica, ed. A. Mai and G. Cozza-Luzi, in Nova Patrum

Bibliotheca, vol. 8(1871), pp. 1-227, and vol. 10(1905), pp. 315-370.

T. Metochites, Miscellanea, ed. Ch. Müller, Leipzig, 1821, reprint: Amsterdam, 1966.

G. Moschabar, Declaration of Patriarch Gregory's Orthodoxy, ed. S. Eustratiades, in EF 5(1910), p. 500.

G. Mouzalon (under the name of Gregory of Cyprus), an Addendum to Gregory's De Processione, 'Against the blasphemies of Bekkos', in MPG 142, cc. 290-300.

G. Pachymeres, De Michaelē et Andronico Palaeologis, in CSHB, ed. I. Bekker, 2 vols., Bonn, 1835.

Philotheos, Contra Gregoram, in MPG 151.

M. Planudes, Epistulae, ed. M. Treu, Breslau, 1890, reprinted at Amsterdam, 1960.

Pseudo-Kodinos, Traité des Offices, ed. J. Verpeaux, Paris, 1966.

G. Scholarios, in Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios, ed. Petit, Siderides, Jugie, 5 vols. Paris, 1928-36. Deuxième traité sur la Procession du Saint-Esprit, vol. 2, pp. 269-457, Polemique anti-latine, vol. 3, pp. 1-204.

S. Syropoulos, Les Mémoires du Grand Ecclesiarque de l'Eglise de Constantinople Sylvestre Syronoulos, ed. V. Laurent, Rome, 1971.

Theodosian Code, transl. and commentary by C. Farr and others, Princeton, 1952.

Theophanes, Continuatus, Chronographia, in MPG 109, cc. 15-500.

Theophylact, Epistolae, in MPG 126, cc. 307-558.

V. Patristic Sources

Ambrose, De spiritu sancto I, MPL 16, cc. 703-742.

Athanasios Epistola I ad Serapionem, MPG 26, cc. 529-608.

- Monarchia, MPG 25, cc. 207-220.
- Oratio III Contra Arianos, MPG 26, cc. 321-468.
- Augustine, Homilia 99, MPL 38, cc. 595-602.
- Cyril of Alexandria, Thesaurus, MPG 75, cc. 9-656.
- Gregory of Nazianzos, Orationes 23, MPG 35, cc. 1131-1168.
- 31 MPG 36, cc. 133-172
- 40 MPG 36, cc. 359-428
- 45 MPG 36, cc. 623-664.
- Gregory of Nyssa, Oratio Catechetica, MPG 45, cc. 9-46.
- Quod non sunt tres dii (Epistola ad Ablabium), MPG 45, cc. 115-136.
- Gregory Palamas, Apodictic Treatise II, ed. Constantinople, 1627.
- Capita physica, theologica, moralia et practica, MPG 150, cc. 1121-1226.
- Défense des saintes hésychastes, ed. J. Meyendorff, Sacrum Lovaniense 30-31, Louvain, 1959.
- Gregory Thaumaturgos, Exposito fidei, MPG 10, cc. 983-998.
- John of Damascus, De fide orthodoxa, MPG 94, cc. 789-1228.
- Homilia in sabbatum sanctum, MPG 96, cc. 601-644.
- Maximos the Confessor, Capita theologica et oeconomica, MPG 90, cc. 1083-1176.
- Opuscula theologica, MPG 91, cc. 9-286.
- Quaestiones ad Thalassium, MPG 90, cc. 1-65, 243-786.
- Origen, Exegeticus in Joannem, 1, 2, MPG 14, cc. 21-184
- Photios, Ad Amphilochem, MPG 101, cc. 45-1172.
- Mystagogia, MPG 102, cc. 279-400.
- Pseudo-Dionysios, De divinis nominibus, MPG 3, cc. 585-996.
- Symeon the New Theologian, Catéchèses, 2, Sources Chrétiennes 104, Paris, 1964.
- Hymnes, 2, Sources Chrétiennes 174, Paris 1971.

Traitées theologiques et ethiques, 1, 2, Sources Chrétiennes 122, 129, Paris 1966-67.

Tarasios, Epistola ad summos sacerdotes, MFG 98, cc. 1459-68.

Theodore the Studite, Epistolarum Liber II, MPG 99, cc. 1115-1670.

VI. Collections of Secondary Sources (Books from which more than one article was used)

Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Etudes Byzantines, Vol. 1, Bucharest, 1974.

Art et Société à Byzance sous les Paléologues, Venice, 1971.

Byzantine Books and Bookmen-Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium 1971, Washington, D.C., 1975.

Cambridge Medieval History, vol. 4, part 2, ed. J.M. Hussey, Cambridge 1967.

R. Janin, Les églises et les monastères de Constantinople, second edition, Paris, 1969.

D.M. Nicol, Byzantium: Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World, London 1972.

P. Underwood, ed., The Kariye Djami, 4 vols., New York, Princeton, 1966-75, Vol. 4: Studies in the Art of the Kariye Djami, Princeton, 1975.

VII. Secondary Sources

H. Ahrweiler, 'L'Histoire et la géographie de la région de Smyrne entre les deux occupations turques (1081-1317), particulièrement au XIIIe siècle', Travaux et Memoires, 1(1965), pp. 1-204.

M.A. Andreeva, Očerki o kul'ture vizantijskago dvora v XIII veke (Travaux de la société royale des sciences de Bohême, Classe des Lettres, N.S. VIII, n. 3), Prague, 1927.

M. Angold, A Byzantine Government in Exile: Government and Society Under the Laskarids of Nicaea (1204-1261), London, 1975.

- S.S. Averentsieff, Poetika rannevisantijskoj literaturi, Moscow, 1977.
- M. Banescu, 'Le patriarche Athanase I et Andronic II Paléologue : état religieux, politique, et social de l'Empire', Académie Roumaine-Bulletin de la section historique 23(1942), pp. 1-28.
- K. Baus, article on Gregory of Cyprus, in Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche ed. J. Hofer and K. Rahner, Freiburg, 1957-65, vol. 4, pp. 1207-8.
- M.C. Beardsley, Aesthetics from Classical Greece to the Present, University, Alabama, reprint 1975.
- H.G. Beck, 'Bildung und Theologie im frühmittelalterlichen Byzance', Polychronion Festschrift F. Dolger zum 75 Geburtstag, Heidelberg, 1966, pp. 69-81.
- Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich, Munich, 1959.
- 'Geistiges Leben in der byzantinischen Kirche des ausgehenden Mittelalters', in Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, ed. H. Jedin, vol. 3, part 2, pp. 608-616, Freiburg, 1968.
- H. Belting, 'Die Auftraggeber der spätbyzantinischen Bildhandschrift', in Art et Société à Byzance sous les Paléologues, pp. 149-176, Venice, 1971.
- G. Böhlig, Untersuchungen zum rhetorischen Sprachgebrauch der Byzantiner, Berlin, 1956.
- A. Boulanger, Aelius Aristede et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie, au IIe siècle de notre ère, Paris, 1923.
- L. Bréhier, article on N. Blemmydes, in Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique, vol. 9, pp. 178-182.
- Le Monde Byzantin III, La civilisation byzantine, Paris, 1970.
- 'L'enseignement classique et l'enseignement religieux à Byzance' in Revue d'histoire et de Philosophie religieuse 21(1941), pp. 34-69.
- 'Notes sur l'histoire de l'enseignement supérieur à Constantinople' in B 3(1926), pp. 73-94, and 4(1927-8), pp. 13-28.

- R. Browning, 'The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century', in B 32(1962), pp. 167-202, and 33(1963), pp. 11-40.
- 'Enlightenment and Repression in Byzantium in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', Past and Present 69, (November, 1975), pp. 3-23.
- 'Byzantinischen Schulen und Schulmeister', Das Altertum 9(1963) pp. 105-108.
- Medieval and Modern Greek, London, 1969.
- F. Cayre, article on Gregory of Cyprus, in DTC, vol. 6, cc. 1231-35, Paris.
- O. Clement, 'Grégoire de Chypre, de l'ekporèse de Saint Esprit', Istina 4-5(1972), pp. 443-456.
- L.C. Contos, 'The Essence-Energies Structure of St. Gregory Palamas with a Brief Examination of Its Patristic Foundations', Greek Orthodox Theological Review 12(1967), pp. 283-294.
- F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone, ed., The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, articles on 'double procession', p. 423 and 'filioque', p. 512, Oxford, 1974.
- J. Darrouzès, article on Gregory of Cyprus, in Dictionnaire de Spiritualité, vol. 6, cc. 922-23, Paris, 1967.
- Recherches sur les 'Ovxiα de l'Eglise Byzantine, Paris, 1970.
- O. Demus, 'The Style of the Kariye Djami and its Place in the Development of Palaeologan Art', in Kariye Djami 4 : Studies in the Art of the Kariye Djami, pp. 109-160, Princeton, 1975.
- A. Diller, 'The Byzantine Quadrivium', in Isis 36(1945-46), p. 132.
- F. Dolger, 'Byzantine Literature', in CMH 4, part 2, pp. 206-263.
- J. Dräseke, 'Der Kircheneinigungsveruch des Kaisers Michael VIII Paläologos', in Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie 34(1891), pp. 332-5.
- 'Zum Philosophen Joseph', in Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie 42(1899), pp. 612-620.

F. Dvornik, The Photian Schism, Cambridge, 1948.

'Photios et la reorganisation de l'académie patriarchale', in
AB 68(1950), pp. 108-125.

P.K. Enepekides, Introduction to The Letters of Maximos Margunios, Bishop of Kythera, ed. Christomanos, Bikelas, and Papadiamantis, Athens, 1970.

S. Eustratiades, 'Ο Πατριάρχης Ἀρσένιος ὁ Ἀπορειανός' in Ἑλληνικά 1(1928), pp. 78-94.

H. Evert-Kappesowa, 'Byzance et le St. Siège à l'époque de l'union de Lyon' in BS 16(1955).

'La société byzantine et l'union de Lyon', in BS 10(1949), pp. 28-41.

'Une page de l'histoire des relations byzantines-latines. Le clergé byzantin et l'union de Lyon (1274-1282)', in BS 13(1952), pp. 68-92.

G. Every, The Byzantine Patriarchate 451-1204, London, 1947.

S. Fassoulakis, The Byzantine Family of Raoul(Rhal(l)es), Athens, 1973.

G. Fatouros, 'Textkritische Beobachtungen zu den Briefen des Gregorios Kyprios', in Revista de Studi Bizantini o Neoellenici 12-13 (1975-76).

F. Fuchs, Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter, Leipzig, 1926, reprinted Amsterdam, 1964.

A. Garzya, 'Observations sur l'Autobiographie de Grégoire de Chypre', in Πρακτικά τοῦ Πρώτου Διεθνoῦς Κυπριολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου II, Leucosia, 1972.

D.J. Geanakoplos, Byzantine East and Latin West, Oxford, 1966.

Byzantium and the Renaissance : Greek Scholars in Venice, Hamden Conn., 1973.

Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, Hamden, Conn., 1973.

Interaction of the 'Sibling' Byzantine and Western Cultures, New Haven, Conn., 1976.

- M. Gedeon, Πατριαρχικὸι Πίνακες - Constantinople, 1890.
- J. Gill, 'The Church Union of the Council of Lyons (1274) Portrayed in Greek Documents', in OCP 40(1974), pp. 5-45.
- 'Emperor Andronikos II and Patriarch Athanasios I', Byzantina 2 (1970), pp. 13-19.
- Article on the 'filioque' in New Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. 5, p. 913ff, Washington D.C., 1967.
- 'Notes on the De Michaelis at Andronico Palaeologis of George Pachymeres', in BZ 68, part 2(1975), pp. 295-303.
- Personalities of the Council of Florence and Other Essays, Oxford, 1964.
- J. Glettner, 'Die Progymnasmata des Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos' in BZ 33(1933), pp. 1-12, 255-70.
- J. Gouillard, 'Après le schisme arsenite - La correspondance de pseudo Jean Chilas', in Académie Roumaine-Bulletin de la section historique 25(1944) pp. 1-20.
- Article on Theoleptos of Philadelphia, in DTC 15, part 1(1946), cc. 339-41.
- A. Grabar, 'Artistic Climate in Byzantium During the Palaeologan Period', in Kariye Djami 4 : Studies in the Art of the Kariye Djami, pp. 1-16, Princeton, 1975.
- B. Grumel, 'La Chronologie', in Traité d'Etudes Byzantines, 1(1928).
- 'Le deuxième concile de Lyon et la reunion de l'Eglise grecque' in DTC 3, part 2(1907), cc. 1391-1410.
- R. Guillard, 'La Correspondance inédite d'Athanase, patriarche de Constantinople', in Mélanges Charles Diehl 1 pp. 121-140, Paris, 1930.
- Essai sur Nicéphore Grégoras, Paris, 1926.
- Recherches sur les institutions byzantines, Berlin and Amsterdam, 1967.

R. Haugh, Photius and the Carolingians, Belmont, Mass., 1975.

A. Heisenberg, Aus der Geschichte und Literatur der Palaiologenzeit,
Munich, 1920.

'Das Problem der Renaissance in Byzance', in Historische Zeitschrift 133(1926), pp. 393-412.

G.F. Hill, A History of Cyprus, vols. 2 and 3, Cambridge, 1948.

G. Hofman, 'Patriarch Johann Bekkos und die Lateinische Kultur', in OCP
11(1945), pp. 141-164.

G.B. Howard, The Schism Between the Oriental and Western Churches,
London, 1892.

H. Hunger, Die Hochsprachliche Profane Literatur der Byzantiner 1, Munich,
1978.

'Von Wissenschaft und Kunst der frühen Palaiologenzeit', in JÖBG
8(1959), pp. 123-55.

J.M. Hussey, Church and Learning in the Byzantine Empire, London, 1937.

M. Edmund Hussey, 'The Persons-Energy Structure in the Theology of St.
Gregory Palamas', St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, 18, 1(1974),
pp. 22-43.

J. Irigoin, 'Centre de Copie et Bibliothèques', in Byzantine Books and
Bookmen, pp. 17-27, Washington, D.C., 1975.

J. Irmscher, 'Autobiographien in der byzantinischen Literatur', in Studia
Byzantina II, pp. 3-11, Berlin, 1973.

R.J.H. Jenkins, 'The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Literature', in DOP
17(1963), pp. 39-52.

M. Jugie, article on N.K. Xanthopoulos, in DTC, vol. 11(1931), c. 446f.

Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium ab ecclesia catholica
dissidentium, vols. 1(1926) and 2(1933), Paris.

J. Karayannopoulos, Πηγαί τῆς Βυζαντινῆς 'Ιστορίας Thessaloniki, 1970.

J.N.D. Kelley, Early Christian Creeds, London 1950.

R. Kerr, A manuscript of George Moschabar, in 15e Congrès International d'Etudes Byzantines : Résumés des Communications.

Ph. Koukoules, Βυζαντινῶν Βίος καὶ Πολιτισμός I, Athens, 1948.

E. Kriaras, 'Diglosie des derniers siècles de Byzance : Naissance de la littérature néo-hellénique', in Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies, pp. 283-292, Oxford, 1967.

K. Krumbacher, Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des östromischen Reiches, Munich, 1897.

S. Kugeas, 'Zur Geschichte der Münchener Thukydideshandschrift Augustanus F' BZ 16(1907), pp. 588-609.

G. Kustas, 'Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric', in Theologia 45(1974), p. 413ff.

M. Kyriakes, 'The University: Origin and Early Phases in Constantinople', in B 41(1971), pp. 161-182.

A.E. Laiou, Constantinople and the Latins, Cambridge, Mass., 1972.

W. Ianeere, La Tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre, Brussels and Rome, 1937.

V. Laurent, 'La chronologie des patriarches de Constantinople au XIIIe siècle (1208-1309)', in REB 27(1969), pp. 142-144.

'La chronologie des patriarches de Constantinople de la première moitié du XIVe siècle (1297-1350)', in REB 7, part 2(1950), pp. 145-155.

'Le cas de Photius dans le apologetique du patriarche Jean XI Bekkos', in EO 29(1930), pp. 396-415.

'La correspondance de Grégoras', in EO 26(1927), p. 360.

'La date de la mort de Irène-Eulogie, la soeur de Michel VIII Paléologue' in REB 27(1969), pp. 209-13.

'La date de la mort de Jean Bekkos', in EO 25(1926), pp. 316-319.

'La date du second synode des Blachernes sous Grégoire de Chypre', in REB 27(1969), pp. 217-219.

'Les dates du second patriarcat de Joseph Ier', in REB 18(1960), pp. 207-208.

V. Laurent and J. Darrouzès, Dossier grec de l'union de Lyon (1273-1277), Paris, 1976.

V. Laurent, 'L'excommunication du patriarche Joseph 1er par son predecesseur Arsene', in BZ 30(1929-30), pp. 489-96.

Article on G. Metochites, in Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, 4, cc. 703-704, Freiburg, 1960.

'Les grandes crises religieuses à Byzance - La fin du schisme Arsenite', in Académie Roumaine-Bulletin de la section historique 26(1945), pp. 225-313.

'Legendes sigillographiques et familles byzantines', in EO 31(1932), pp. 327-349.

'Un polemist grec de la fin du XIIIe siècle. La vie et les oeuvres de Georges Moschabar', in EO 28(1929), pp. 129-158.

'Une princesse au cloître : Irène Eulogie Choumnos Paléogine', in EO 29(1930), pp. 29-60.

'Le quadrivium et la formation intellectuelle sous les Paléologues, Preface to P. Tannery, Quadrivium de Georges Pachymère, pp. xvii-xliii, Studi e Testi 94, Vatican City, 1940.

Les Régestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople I, fasc. 4: Les Régestes de 1208 à 1309 (Le Patriarcat Byzantin. Recherches de diplomatique, d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques publiées par l'Institut d'Etudes Byzantines, Paris, Série 1), Paris, 1971.

'Le schisme antiarsenite du metropolite du Philadelphie Théolepte (circa 1324)', in REB 18(1960), pp. 45-54.

'Le serment anti-Latin du Patriarche Joseph 1er', in EO 26(1927), pp. 396-407.

'Le serment de l'empereur Andronic II Paléologue au patriarche Athanase 1er lors de sa seconde accession au trône oecumenique (Sept. 1303)', in REB 23(1965).

- V. Laurent, 'Les signataires du second concile des Blachernes', in EO 26(1927), pp. 129-149.
- P. Lemerle, Le premier humanisme byzantin, Paris, 1971.
- Élèves et professeurs 'à Constantinople au Xe siècle', a lecture to the Académie des Inscr. et Belle-Lettres, Paris, 28 November 1969.
- F. Lenz, 'On the Authorship of the Leptinean Declamations Attributed to Aristides', in American Journal of Philology 63(1942), pp. 154-173.
- R.J. Loenertz, 'Théodore le Metochite et son père', in Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum 23(1953), pp. 184-194.
- Chr. Loparev, 'ὁ Ἀθανάσιος ὁ Β΄ πατριάρχης Ἀλεξανδρείας' in EF 1(1908) pp.456-472; in Russian in VV 15(1908), pp. 287-299.
- V. Lossky, A l'image et à la ressemblance de Dieu, Paris, 1967. (Published in English as In the Image and Likeness of God, Crestwood, New York, 1974.)
- The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church, London, 1957.
- The Vision of God, London, 1963.
- C. Mango, 'Byzantine Literature as a Distorting Mirror', Inaugural lecture delivered before the University of Oxford, Oxford, 1975.
- G. Mathew, Byzantine Aesthetics, (reprint: New York, 1971).
- K.P. Matschke, 'Politik und Kirche im spätbyzantinischen Reich : Athanasios I Patriarch von Konstantinopel 1289-1293, 1303-1309', in Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift Universität Leipzig 15(1966), pp. 479-86.
- J. Meyendorff, A Study of Gregory Palamas, London, 1964.
- Byzantine Theology : Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes, Oxford, 1975.
- 'Society and Culture in the Fourteenth Century. Religious Problems', in Actes du XI^{ve} Congrès International des Etudes Byzantines I, pp. 111-124, Bucharest, 1974.

- J. Meyendorff, 'Spiritual Trends in Byzantium in the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries', in Art et Société à Byzance sous les Paléologues, Venice, 1971 (=Kariye Djami IV, pp. 93-106).
- G. Misch, 'Die Schriftsteller-Autobiographie und Bildungsgeschichte eines Patriarchen von Konstantinopel aus dem XIII Jahrhundert', in Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts 21(1931), pp. 1-16.
- G. Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica I, Berlin, 1958.
- C. Neumann, 'Byzantinische Kultur und Renaissancekultur', in Historische Zeitschrift 91(1903), pp. 215-232.
- D.M. Nicol, The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos, Washington, D.C., 1966.
- 'Constantine Akropolites : A Prosopographical Note', in DOP 19(1965) pp. 249-256.
- 'The Byzantine Church and Hellenic Learning', in Byzantium : Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World, article 12, London, 1972.
- 'The Byzantine Reaction to Lyons', in Byzantium : Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World article 6, London 1972.
- 'The Preliminaries to the Second Council of Lyons', in Byzantium : Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World, article 5, London, 1972.
- The Last Centuries of Byzantium, London, 1972.
- G. Ostrogorsky, History of the Byzantine State, Oxford, 1968.
- A. Papadakis, 'Gregory II of Cyprus and Mark's Report Again' in The Greek Orthodox Theological Review 21(1976), pp. 147-157.
- 'Gregory II of Cyprus and an Unpublished Report to the Synod', in GRBS 16(1975), pp. 227-239.
- 'Late Thirteenth Century Byzantine Theology and Gregory II of Cyprus', in The Byzantine Fellowship Lectures 2 : Byzantine Ecclesiastical Personalities, Brookline, Mass., 1975.

Chr. Papadopoulos, 'ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας Ἀθανάσιος Β΄' in EEBS 6(1929), pp. 3-13.

Ἱστορία τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἀλεξανδρείας - Alexandria, 1935.

S. Papadopoulos, article on Gregory of Cyprus, in CHE 4, cc. 731-4, Athens, 1964.

Th. Papadopoulos, Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People Under Turkish Dominion, Bibliotheca Graeca Aevi Posterioris I, Brussels, 1952.

A. Patacsi, 'Palamism Before Palamas', Eastern Churches Review 9, 1-2 (1977), pp. 64-71.

J. Patinot, article on George Metochites, in ΘHE 18, cc. 1097-98, Athens, 1966.

L. Petit, 'Jean Beccos ou Jean XI', in DTC 8, part 1(1924), cc. 656-660.

'Arsène Autorianus et les Arsénites', in DTC 1, part 2, cc. 1991-1994.

'Joseph le Galésiot', in DTC 8, part 2(1925), cc. 1541-2.

S. Petrides, 'Chrysobulle de l'impératrice Theodora', in EO 26(1927), pp. 25-28.

'Sentence synodique contre le clergé unioniste', in EO 14(1911), pp. 133-136.

L. Politis, 'Eine Schreiberschule im Kloster τῶν Ὁδηγῶν' in BZ 51(1958), pp. 17-36, 261-87.

A. Radovic, Τὸ Μυστήριον τῆς Ἀγίας Τριάδος κατὰ τὸν Ἅγιον Γρηγόριον Παλαμᾶ, Analecta Vlatadon 16, Thessaloniki, 1973.

B. Roberg, Die Union zwischen der griechischen und der lateinischen Kirche auf dem II Konzil von Lyon, Bonn, 1964.

S. Runciman, The Eastern Schism, Oxford, 1955.

The Great Church in Captivity, Cambridge, 1968.

The Last Byzantine Renaissance, Cambridge, 1970.

S. Runciman, The Sicilian Vespers, Cambridge, 1958.

S. Salaville, 'Deux documents inédits sur les dissensions religieuses byzantines entre 1275 et 1310', in REB 5(1947), pp. 116-136.

'Un directeur spirituel à Byzance au début du XIVe siècle: Théolepte de Philadelphie', in Melanges Joseph de Ghellinkck II, pp. 877-888, Gembloux, 1951.

'Formes ou méthodes de prière d'après un Byzantin du XIVe siècle', in EO 39(1940), pp. 1-25.

Article on George Metochites, in DTC 6(1920), cc. 1238-39.

'La vie monastique grecque au début du XIVe siècle après un discours inédit de Théolepte de Philadelphie', in REB 5(1947), pp. 100-115.

G. Sarton, Introduction to the History of Science, Vols. 1-3, Baltimore, 1927-48.

F. Schemmel, 'Die Schulen von Konstantinopel vom 12-15 Jahrhundert', in Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift 25(1925), cc. 236-239.

O. Schissel, 'Rhetorische Progymnasmatik der Byzantiner', in BNJ 11(1934-35) pp. 1-10.

K.M. Setton, 'The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance', in Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 100(1956).

The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571) I, Philadelphia, 1976.

I. Ševčenko, Etudes sur la polémique entre Théodore Metochite et Nicéphore Choumnos, Brussels, 1962.

'Society and Intellectual Life in the Fourteenth Century', in Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Etudes Byzantines I, pp. 69-92, Bucharest, 1974.

'Théodore Métochites, Chora et les courants intellectuels de l'époque', in Art et Société à Byzance sous les Paléologues, pp. 13-39, Venice, 1971 (=with addenda, 'Theodore Metochites, the

Chora and the Intellectual Trends of His Time', in Kariye Djami 4, pp. 17-91).

P. Sherrard, The Greek East and Latin West, Oxford, 1959.

R. Souarn, 'Tentatives d'union avec Rome : Un patriarche grec catholique au XIII^e siècle (Jean Vekkos)', in EO 3(1899-1900), pp. 229-37, 351-361.

P. Speck, Die Kaiserliche Universität von Konstantinopel, Munich, 1974.

I. Sykoutres, article on Enkomion to St. Dionysios the Areopagite by Gregory of Cyprus, in EF 23(1924), pp. 418-424.

'Περὶ τὸ σχῆμα τῶν Ἀρκενιῶν' in Ἑλληνικά 2(1929), pp. 267-332; 3(1930), pp. 15-44; 5(1932), pp. 107-126 (this final part includes an article on Methodios the Monk and Gregory of Cyprus, pp. 117-126.).

'Problem der byzantinische Epistolographie', in Actes du III^e Congrès international d'études byzantines, pp. 295-310, Athens, 1932.

'Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς τόμος τῆς ἐκλογῆς τοῦ πατριάρχου Γερμανοῦ τοῦ Γ' in ΕΕΦΣ 9(1932), pp. 178-212.

A.M.M. Talbot, 'The Patriarch Athanasios and the Church', in DOP 27(1973), pp. 13-28.

B. Tatakis, La philosophie byzantine, second edition, Paris 1959.

E. Trap, ed., Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit, 2, Vienna, 1977.

M. Treu, 'Manuel Holobolos', in BZ 5(1896), pp. 538-559.

'Der Philosoph Joseph', in BZ 8(1899), pp. 1-64.

I.E. Troitskij, Arsenij i Arsenity, London, 1973.

'K istorii sporov po voprosu ob isxoždenii Svjatago Duxa', in Christianskoe Čtenie 69(1889), part 1, pp. 338-377, 581-605; part 2, pp. 280-352, 520-570. (The bulk of the material consists of the translations of the relevant documents into Russian.)

A. Tuilier, 'Recherches sur les origines de la renaissance byzantine au XIII^e siècle', in Bulletin de l'association G. Budé, 4, n. 3 (October, 1955), pp. 71-76.

A.A. Vasiliev, History of the Byzantine Empire, Madison, Wis., 1964.

J. Verpeaux, Nicéphore Choumnos, homme d'état et humaniste byzantin, Paris, 1959.

K. Vogel, 'Byzantine Science', in CMH 4, part 2, pp. 264-305.

K.T. Ware, 'The Debate About Palamism', Eastern Churches Review 9, 1-2(1977), pp. 45-63.

The Orthodox Church, Penguin Books, 1963.

C. Wendel, article on Maximos Planudes, in Fauly Wissowa 20, part 2(1950), cc. 2205-2253.

'Planudea', in BZ 40(1940), pp. 406-445.

K. Weitzmann, 'The Selection of Texts for Cyclic Illustration in Byzantine Manuscripts', in Byzantine Books and Bookmen, pp. 69-109, Washington, D.C., 1975.

N.G. Wilson, 'Books and Readers in Byzantium', in Byzantine Books and Bookmen, pp. 1-15, Washinton, D.C., 1975.

'The Church and Classical Learning in Byzantium', in Antike und Abendland 16(1970), pp. 68-77.

'The Libraries of the Byzantine World', in GRBS 8(1967), pp. 53-80.

A.D. Zotos, Ἰωάννης ὁ Βέκκος πατριάρχης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως νέας Ῥώμης ὁ λατινόφωνος, Munich, 1920.